

CA30NHW Q60

77P76

HAMILTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 2022 21292976 0

HAMILTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
SEP 20 1976
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

L PUBLIC MEETINGS

ON

SELECTING A PREFERRED
REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PATTERN

HAMILTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

REFERENCE COLLECTION

URBAN/MUNICIPAL



FOR USE IN LIBRARY ONLY

HAMILTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

SEP 29 1978

COPY. /

HAMILTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
SEP 29 1978
GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROGRAMME
REPORT ON
THE PUBLIC MEETINGS
ON SELECTING A PREFERRED
REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PATTERN
FOR THE REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN

May 1977
Regional Plan Division
Planning and Development Division
Regional Municipality of Hamilton-
Wentworth



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION
- 2.0 THE SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC MEETINGS AND OPEN HOUSES
- 3.0 SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP ISSUES
 - 3.1 Glanbrook Public Meeting
 - 3.2 Dundas Public Meeting
 - 3.3 Stoney Creek Public Meeting
 - 3.4 Ancaster Public Meeting
 - 3.5 Hamilton Public Meeting
 - 3.6 Flamborough Public Meeting
- 4.0 SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS
 - 4.1 The Development Pattern
 - 4.2 Development in the Rural Area
 - 4.3 Population
 - 4.4 Employment
 - 4.5 Industrial Development
 - 4.6 Retail-Office Centres
 - 4.7 Loss of Prime Agricultural Land
 - 4.8 Amount of Fruit Belt to be Preserved
 - 4.9 Regional Costs
 - 4.10 Location of Expanded Airport
 - 4.11 Landfill Sites
- 5.0 ANALYSIS OF GLANBROOK QUESTIONNAIRE
- 6.0 ANALYSIS OF DUNDAS QUESTIONNAIRE
- 7.0 ANALYSIS OF STONEY CREEK QUESTIONNAIRE
- 8.0 ANALYSIS OF ANCASTER QUESTIONNAIRE
- 9.0 ANALYSIS OF HAMILTON QUESTIONNAIRE
- 10.0 ANALYSIS OF FLAMBOROUGH QUESTIONNAIRE



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Hamilton Public Library

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - Tabular Results of Glanbrook Questionnaire

APPENDIX B - Tabular Results of Dundas Questionnaire

APPENDIX C - Tabular Results of Stoney Creek Questionnaire

APPENDIX D - Tabular Results of Ancaster Questionnaire

APPENDIX E - Tabular Results of Hamilton Questionnaire

APPENDIX F - Tabular Results of Flamborough Questionnaire

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Beginning in February 1977, the Regional Plan Division became vigorously involved in a public participation programme aimed at obtaining public input into the selection of a Preferred Regional Development Pattern for the Regional Official Plan. Sponsored by the Regional Planning and Development Committee, a series of public meetings to discuss the Alternative Regional Development Patterns were held in each of the six area municipalities. A questionnaire designed to obtain public input on a number of Regional issues was prepared for distribution to those present at the public meetings.

In addition, so that the public could have the opportunity to review the Alternatives before the public meetings, an open house displaying the Alternatives was conducted in each municipality by Regional Planning Staff.

The information developed at these public meetings and open houses along with that from the third Regional Official Plan Seminar and that from the submissions received from the area municipalities and the public are being considered by the Regional Planning Staff in developing its recommended Regional Development Pattern.

This report has been prepared to document the information obtained from the public meetings. The following section of the report briefly describes the schedule and format of the public meetings and open houses. The third section attempts to summarize the issues raised during discussions at the workshop sessions. Section 4 provides a summary of the questionnaire results and attempts to compare results among the six area municipalities. This section can be looked upon as a summary of the remaining six sections of the Report. These six sections give a more detailed breakdown of the questionnaire results by municipality.

2.0 THE SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC MEETINGS AND OPEN HOUSES

2.1 The Public Meetings

2.1.1 The Format

The schedule of the public meetings is given in the accompanying chart (Chart 1). In total nine public meetings were held, with one public meeting in each of the municipalities of Glanbrook, Dundas, Stoney Creek and Ancaster, two public meetings in Flamborough and three in the City of Hamilton. All the meetings were held at local schools so as to make them as accessible as possible to the general public.

Each of the Glanbrook and Flamborough public meetings were held jointly with the local municipality Councils and their planning

CHART 1

SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC MEETINGS

MUNICIPALITY	DATE (1977)	LOCATION	ATTENDANCE (approx.)	NO. OF WORKSHOPS	NO. OF QUESTIONNAIRES FILLED OUT
GLANBROOK	February 28	Mount Hope Public School	275	8	141
DUNDAS	March 10	Parkside High School	80	5	47
STONEY CREEK	March 16	Saltfleet High School	65	4	47
HAMILTON	March 21	Sir John A. MacDonald Secondary School	15	1	39
	March 24	Hill Park Secondary School	35	1	
	April 4	Viscount Montgomery Public School	15	1	
ANCASTER	March 23	Ancaster High and Vocational School	125	5	66
FLAMBOROUGH	March 31	Waterdown High School	250	8	174
	April 4	Beverly Central Public School	175	8	

consultants who were presenting their Draft Local Official Plan proposals to the local residents. Two public meetings were scheduled in Flamborough because of its large geographical size.

A total of three public meetings were scheduled in the City of Hamilton because of its large population and vast geographical area. The first public meeting was held in the downtown area of Hamilton so as to be accessible to residents living in the central and western portion of the City. The second meeting took place on the mountain to attract residents living on the mountain, while the third meeting was held in the east end of the City for residents living in that area.

Except for the Glanbrook meeting which started at 8:00 p.m., all the public meetings began at 7:30 p.m. and finished at approximately 11:00 p.m.

All the public meetings followed a similar format. In most cases, each meeting began with introductory remarks by the Mayor of the local municipality, the Regional Chairman and Chairman of the Regional Planning and Development Committee. This was followed by a presentation of the Seven Alternative Regional Development Patterns by the Director of the Regional Plan Division. During the remaining two hours of the meeting, those attending the meeting were involved in workshop sessions, where the issues relevant to the selection of a Preferred Regional Development Pattern were extensively discussed.

At the Glanbrook and Flamborough public meetings which were joint meetings with the local municipal Councils, the Draft Local Official Plan proposals were presented in addition to the Regional development alternatives. Workshops at these meetings dealt with both Regional and local issues.

2.1.2 Attendance

Attendance at the public meetings ranged from 15 people to 275 people (Chart 1). Attendance at the Glanbrook and Flamborough meetings was particularly high. This can be explained, in part, by the fact that these meetings were held to discuss local as well as Regional planning matters.

The Ancaster public meeting was quite well attended while attendance in Dundas and Stoney Creek was poor. Attendance at the three Hamilton public meetings was very disappointing.

2.1.3 Workshops

All the workshops followed a similar agenda. A Regional or Local Councillor or a Regional Planner acted as a discussion leader for each workshop. In addition, Regional planners were on hand at all workshops to answer questions. Local as well as Regional planners were involved in the workshops at the Glanbrook and Flamborough Public Meetings, since both Regional and Local issues were discussed.

In some of the larger workshops, participants first broke up into smaller groups of four to formulate questions before meeting as a workshop group. At the end of each workshop, all participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire designed to obtain input in identifying the "preferred" regional development pattern. The questionnaire distributed at the Glanbrook and Flamborough Public Meetings, however, dealt with their respective Draft Local Official Plans as well as the Regional development alternatives.

2.2 The Open Houses

In total, seven open houses were held throughout the Region as indicated in Chart 2. One open house was held in each of the municipalities of Glanbrook, Dundas, Stoney Creek, Ancaster and Flamborough while two open houses were held in the City of Hamilton.

Except for the second open house in Hamilton, all the open houses were held at the local municipal offices and were scheduled from 2:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. to give local residents ample opportunity to attend.

Attendance at the open houses varied from approximately 20 people at the Stoney Creek and Hamilton Open Houses to 150 at the Flamborough Open House.

CHART 2

SCHEDULE OF OPEN HOUSES

MUNICIPALITY	DATE (1977)	LOCATION	ATTENDANCE (approx.)
GLANBROOK	February 24	Glanford Community Hall	60
DUNDAS	March 8	Dundas Town Hall	75
STONEY CREEK	March 14	Stoney Creek Municipal Offices	25
HAMILTON	March 18	Hamilton City Hall	20
	March 30	Lloyd D. Jackson Square - Phase 2	Undetermined
ANCASTER	March 22	Ancaster Municipal Offices	80
FLAMBOROUGH	March 29	Flamborough Municipal Offices	150

3.0 SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP ISSUES

A summary of issues relevant to the selection of a Preferred Regional Development Pattern were raised at the workshops held during each of the public meetings. This section of the report summarizes the comments by municipality. The comments have been entered under the appropriate issue categories. In many cases, similar comments have been combined to present a point of view more clearly. Every effort has been made to retain the essence of the comments.

3.1 Workshop Issues--Glanbrook Public Meeting

3.1.1 The Urban Area

- . Glanbrook residential and industrial growth south of the Hamilton boundary
- . housing types and densities
- . growth outside the main urban areas and the concentration of growth
- . Binbrook centred growth, cost of services and type of development for Binbrook
- . adequacy of potential growth in Mount Hope
- . strip development pressures along major roads i.e. Highways #6 and #53, with and without urban services
- . the effect of the provision of urban services on population and employment growth

3.1.2 Development in the Rural Area

- . directing future growth in the existing settlement areas
- . the number of land severances allowed, to whom, and on what type of agricultural land

3.1.3 Population

- . location of future population
- . high density corridors
- . reliability of population projections

3.1.4 Industrial Development

- . industrial development and the municipal tax base
- . industrial growth around Mount Hope Airport

3.1.5 Retail Office Centres

- . type of services provided at Regional and municipal centre, i.e. commercial, retail, etc.

3.1.6 Agriculture

- . the difference in loss of agricultural land among the Alternative Regional Development Patterns
- . the recent provincial Green Paper on "Planning For Agriculture: Food Land Guidelines"

3.1.7 Regional Costs

- . type of services included in the Regional cost estimates
- . distribution of Regional costs to all area municipalities and cost to each municipality

- . cost of providing urban services to Binbrook
- . time required to obtain finances for servicing Binbrook and Mount Hope

3.1.8 Airport

- . alternative locations of an expanded airport facility
- . date of the Federal Government decision
- . Glanbrook Council's decision to oppose expansion at the present airport site
- . location of potential industrial and residential growth relative to the present airport location

3.1.9 Landfill Sites

- . alternatives to landfill as a method of solid waste disposal
- . locations and service areas for landfill sites in the Region

3.1.10 Transportation

- . adequacy of downtown Hamilton's transportation facilities relative to the increase in population and employment
- . need for improved public transit between Glanbrook and Hamilton
- . concern over the Hamilton-Nanticoke Highway No. 6 corridor and the Red Hill Creek corridor

3.1.11 Miscellaneous

- . compatibility between Regional development alternatives and the proposed Local Official Plan

3.2 Workshop Issues--Dundas Public Meeting

3.2.1 The Urban Area

- . housing mix and densities
- . purpose of high density corridors and their impact on surrounding neighbourhoods
- . social and land use implications of additional apartment growth
- . decentralization of growth
- . benefits and costs of urban growth
- . status of the Parkway Belt West Plan, and its effect on development and its relationship to the Regional Official Plan
- . the impact of the Western Alternative on Dundas

3.2.2 Development in the Rural Area

- . ability of settlement areas (particularly in Glanbrook) to accommodate the majority of rural development

3.2.3 Population

- . distribution of population
- . reliability of population projections and assumptions on household size

3.2.4 Employment

- . location of employment
- . reliability of employment projections

3.2.5 Industrial Development

- . decentralization of industry in the Region
- . desirability of additional industrial land in Dundas, its location and type, and its ability to attract population
- . effect of industrial land on municipal tax base

3.2.6 Agriculture

- . the significance of the loss of agricultural land and our ability to feed ourselves

3.2.7 The Fruit Belt

- . the Fruit Belt as a resource and the economics of preservation

3.2.8 Regional Costs

- . Regional costs relative to Dundas

3.2.9 Solid Waste Disposal

- . locations and service areas for landfill sites
- . alternatives to landfill as a method of solid waste disposal
- . expansion of Dundas sewage treatment plant and increased effluent in Cootes Paradise

3.2.10 Transportation

- . selection of the most efficient transportation system
- . public transportation and high density corridors

3.3 Workshop Issues--Stoney Creek Public Meeting

3.3.1 The Urban Area

- . controlling urban development due to the extension of the trunk sewers to Winona
- . purpose of high density corridors; alternative locations; their impacts on surrounding neighbourhoods
- . the future of the Saltfleet Community

3.3.2 Development in the Rural Area

- . allowing severances in areas that will never be serviced

3.3.3 Employment

- . decentralization of employment
- . reliability of employment projections

3.3.4 Industrial Development

- . decentralization of industrial development
- . effect of increased industrial development on the municipal tax base
- . location and type of industrial development

3.3.5 Retail-Office Centres

- . dispersion of retail-office growth

3.3.6 Agriculture

- . the viability of agricultural land for productive farming

3.3.7 The Fruit Belt

- . the viability and value of the Fruit Belt in Hamilton-Wentworth
- . responsibility, by whom, for preservation of the Fruitlands

3.3.8 Regional Costs

- . differences in Regional costs among the Alternative Regional Development Patterns

3.3.9 Airport

- . improvements in transportation facilities required by the airport expansion

3.3.10 Transportation

- . inefficiency and inadequacy of the existing transit system, particularly on the mountain

3.3.11 Miscellaneous

- . delivery of health services under each Alternative Regional Development Pattern
- . erosion of the Lakeshore

3.4 Workshop Issues--Ancaster Public Meeting

3.4.1 The Urban Area

- . phasing and timing of urban development i.e. residential vs. industrial growth
- . characteristics and desirability of high density corridors
- . retention of Ancaster's character and preservation of Ancaster's identity through physical separation from the other area municipalities
- . affordability of housing in Ancaster
- . effect of rapid growth under some of the alternatives

3.4.2 Development in the Rural Area

- . land severances on poorest quality agricultural lands

3.4.3 Population

- . desirable growth rate for Region and Ancaster

3.4.4 Employment

- . employment located in Ancaster vs. employment for Ancaster residents

3.4.5 Industrial Development

- . decentralization of industrial development
- . effect of industrial development on the local tax base

3.4.6 Retail-Office Centres

- . centralization vs. decentralization of retail-office development

3.4.7 Agriculture

- . definition of prime agricultural land and its preservation

3.4.8 The Fruit Belt

- . preservation of the Fruit Belt as a valuable future resource
- . economic viability of the fruitlands
- . degree of awareness by senior levels of government of farmers' problems

3.4.9 Regional Costs

- . accuracy of cost estimates

3.4.10 Airport

- . impacts of airport expansion on Ancaster
- . future land uses in areas surrounding the airport
- . effect of airport decision on the Alternative Regional Development Patterns

3.4.11 Transportation

- . improved transit for Ancaster
- . public transit as an energy saver

3.5 Workshop Issues--Hamilton Public Meetings

3.5.1 The Urban Area

- . impacts of high density residential corridors
- . higher density residential development to reduce consumption of farmland by urban development
- . full utilization of serviced land

3.5.2 Industrial Development

- . amount of industrial land necessary in Hamilton
- . increased industrial land and employment opportunities

3.5.3 Regional Costs

- . capital and operating transportation costs in high density corridors

3.5.4 Transportation

- . construction of the Hamilton Mountain Freeway
- . transportation facility in Red Hill Creek area
- . public transit between downtown Hamilton and the Hamilton Mountain

3.6 Workshop Issues--Flamborough Public Meetings

3.6.1 The Urban Area

- . growth in Waterdown and its impact on availability of water and sewage disposal
- . housing mix in residential areas of Flamborough
- . maintenance of rural character of Flamborough

3.6.2 Development in the Rural Area

- . amount of development to be allowed in the Flamborough settlement areas
- . restrictive vs. less restrictive land severance policies
- . location of estate type of development
- . land uses in the rural areas

3.6.3 Population

- . population growth rates for Waterdown and Flamborough
- . impact of population growth in a rural area

3.6.4 Employment

- . employment growth rate in Flamborough

3.6.5 Industrial Development

- . type, amount, and location of industrial development in Flamborough
- . the effects of increased industrial development on the municipal tax base
- . concentration vs. dispersion of industrial development in the Region
- . competition among the area municipalities for industrial land
- . rehabilitation of abandoned and existing pits and quarries

3.6.6 Retail-Office Centres

- . sites for commercial development in Flamborough

3.6.7 Agriculture

- . definition and location of prime agricultural land
- . use of productive farmland for development

3.6.8 The Fruit Belt

- . preservation of the Fruit Belt as a resource and its economics

3.6.9 Regional Costs

- . relationship between growth and municipal tax base
- . proportion of Regional costs borne by Flamborough
- . cost of sewers for Waterdown area

3.6.10 Transportation

- . necessity of by-pass around Waterdown

3.6.11 Miscellaneous

- . the relationship between the Regional and Local Official Plans

4.0 SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

4.1 The Development Pattern

4.1.1 The Housing Mix

There was strong agreement in all of the area municipalities that each municipality should provide a variety of housing in the future, including rental accommodation, to meet the needs of all age and income groups in the Region. Over 70% of the questionnaire respondents from the Glanbrook, Dundas, Ancaster and Flamborough Public Meetings and approximately 90% of these from the Stoney Creek and Hamilton Public Meetings took this position.

Referring to the type of housing mix favoured in each municipality, the Glanbrook respondents were in favour of either all single family housing (35.5%) or single family housing with some townhouse development (31.2%) being built in Glanbrook.

The highest percent of respondents from Dundas (36.2%), Stoney Creek (40.4%), Hamilton (41%) and Ancaster (45.5%) would like future residential development in each of their municipalities to consist of mostly single family housing with some townhouse and apartment development.

Flamborough respondents were of mixed opinion about the type of housing mix they favoured for Flamborough. While 21.9% of the respondents favoured all single family housing, 31.6% favoured mostly single family with some townhouse development. However, 29.3% showed a preference for mostly single family housing with some townhouse and apartment development.

4.1.2 The Preferred Regional Development Pattern

While there was some variation among the municipalities, the C.O.L.U.C., South Central, South Decentralized and Conglomerate Alternatives appeared to receive the greatest support among the respondents.

The Conglomerate Alternative was the preferred alternative by the highest percent (40%) of the Glanbrook respondents, followed by the South Central Alternative (9.9%).

Among the Dundas respondents, nearly equal percentages favoured the South Decentralized and C.O.L.U.C. Alternatives, 25.5% and 23.4% respectively.

The Eastern Alternative was the preferred alternative by over 46% of the Stoney Creek respondents, who showed some preference, as well, for the Trend (12.8%) and South Central (12.8%) Alternatives.

Among the Ancaster respondents, 30.3% favoured the South Central Alternative, followed by 13.6% who favoured the South Decentralized Alternative and another 12.1% who favoured the Western Alternative.

Nearly equal percentages of Hamilton respondents showed a preference for the South Decentralized (23.1%) and C.O.L.U.C. (20.5%) Alternatives.

In addition, 17.9% favoured the South Central Alternative.

The Conglomerate Alternative was the preferred alternative by 19.5% of the Flamborough respondents, followed by the Western Alternative which was favoured by 16.1% of the respondents. In addition, the South Central and C.O.L.U.C. Alternatives were preferred by 11.5% and 10.9% respectively, of the Flamborough respondents.

4.1.3 Proposed Glanbrook Local Official Plan

The Glanbrook respondents were of mixed opinion regarding the proposed Glanbrook Official Plan. Approximately 55% of the respondents agreed with the proposed development patterns for Glanbrook. However, 25.5% disagreed with the proposal while the remaining 19.1% did not respond to the question.

4.1.4 Proposed Flamborough Local Official Plan

There was also mixed opinion regarding the proposed Flamborough Official Plan. While 44% of the Flamborough respondents agreed with the proposed development pattern for Flamborough, another 35.1% disagreed with the proposal. The remaining 20.1% appeared to be undecided and did not take a position regarding the proposal.

Referring to the proposal to make Waterdown a heritage village, over 74% of the Flamborough respondents agreed with it, while 14.9% disagreed.

4.1.5 High Density Residential Corridors in Hamilton

Response among the Hamilton respondents was mixed to the concept of redeveloping some areas in the City of Hamilton into high density residential corridors.

A nearly equal percentage of Hamilton respondents (48.7%) were in favour of establishing a high density residential corridor on Hamilton Mountain, along Upper James and Upper Wellington Streets, as those who were opposed to the proposal (41%).

A similar response was received to the proposal of establishing a high density residential corridor along Main and King Streets, between Downtown Hamilton and Highway 403. While 46.7% were in favour of such a proposal, 33.3% disagreed and the remaining 20.5% did not give a reply.

A mixed response was also given to the proposal of establishing such a corridor along Main Street West, between Highway 8 and the City limits. The response to this proposal was inconclusive, with 43.6% of the respondents favouring it, 35.9% opposing it, and 20.5% not stating their position.

4.2 Development In The Rural Area

4.2.1 Rural Settlement Development

The majority of respondents in all the area municipalities agreed that, in the Rural Area future residential development should be located mainly in existing settlement areas that have good potential for expansion. This position was adopted by over 70% of the respondents from Dundas, Flamborough, Glanbrook and Stoney Creek and over 80% of the Ancaster and Hamilton respondents.

4.2.2 Land Severances

4.2.2.1 Land Severances in Prime Agricultural Areas

All the area municipalities, except Flamborough, showed some indecision regarding the issue of restricting land severances in prime agricultural areas. This indecision is reflected by high percentages of respondents, ranging from 15.4% to 30.5%, who did not respond to the question.

There was, however, considerable agreement among respondents from Dundas (68.1%), Ancaster (68.2%) and Hamilton (79.5%) that land severances should be discouraged in prime agricultural areas and considered on the basis of restrictive severance policies for agricultural purposes only.

There was less agreement among respondents from Glanbrook and Stoney Creek. Among the Glanbrook respondents, the response was mixed, with 46.8% of the respondents maintaining that land severances on prime agricultural areas should be restricted for agricultural purposes only. However, 22.7% of the Glanbrook respondents disagreed with this position while 30.5% seemed to be undecided about this issue.

Response among the Stoney Creek respondents to this issue was also mixed. There were nearly equal percentages of respondents who agreed (38.3%) and those who disagreed (31.9%) with restricting land severances in prime agricultural areas for agricultural purposes only. In addition, 29.8% did not give a response to this issue.

Among the Flamborough respondents, the highest percent (53.5%) were of the opinion that residential land severances on prime agricultural land should be allowed for farm retirement, and sons and daughters of farmers. However, 21.3% felt that residential land severances in such areas should be permitted for agricultural purposes only. There was a group of respondents (19.5%) who felt that residential severances in such areas should be allowed for other purposes than agricultural, farm retirement, and sons and daughters of farmers.

4.2.2.2 Land Severances in Other Than Prime Agricultural Areas

All area municipalities, except Flamborough, seemed to show some indecision regarding the issue of allowing land severances in other

than prime agricultural areas. A range of 20.5% to 31.8% of the respondents from these municipalities did not respond to this question, suggesting they were undecided about the issue.

High percentages of respondents from Flamborough (79.3%), Glanbrook (61.7%) and Stoney Creek (63.8%) showed agreement with the concept that residential land severances in other than prime agricultural areas should be allowed on the basis of less restrictive severance policies.

However, there was less agreement among respondents from Ancaster, Dundas and Hamilton. Among the Ancaster respondents, the response was mixed, with 53% of the respondents agreeing that land severances in other than prime agricultural areas should be allowed, 15.2% disagreeing with such a proposal and another 31.8% being undecided.

Response from Dundas respondents was also mixed, with 46.8% agreeing with such a concept while 27.7% disagreed and 25.5% not responding to the question.

Hamilton respondents seemed to be undecided about this issue as well. While 56.4% of the Hamilton respondents agreed with allowing land severances in other than prime agricultural areas, 23.1% disagreed and another 20.5% appeared to be undecided.

4.3 Population

4.3.1 Glanbrook Year 2001 Population

Glanbrook respondents were of mixed opinion regarding what population they would like to see in Glanbrook by the year 2001. While 35.5% favoured a moderate population figure of 20,000 people for Glanbrook, another 28.3% endorsed the low projection of 15,000 people. In addition, the high population projection of 22,000 was favoured by 22% of the Glanbrook respondents.

4.3.2 Dundas Year 2001 Population

The majority of the Dundas respondents (61.7%) were of the opinion that a year 2001 population of 21,000 people for the Town of Dundas, as projected under all seven alternative Regional development patterns was acceptable. However, 17.1% felt that this figure is too high, while approximately 11% felt that it was too low and favoured a population of between 25,000 to 30,000 people.

4.3.3 Stoney Creek Year 2001 Population

The highest percentage of the Stoney Creek respondents (42.5%) favoured a moderate population growth for Stoney Creek, giving it a population of 70,100 to 76,500 people by the year 2001. On the other hand, 31.9% of the respondents endorsed the high population projection of 114,000 people for the year 2001. The low population projection of 49,100 people was favoured by only 10.7%.

4.3.4 Ancaster Year 2001 Population

The highest percent of Ancaster respondents (42.4%) favoured a moderate future population growth in Ancaster to 23,500 people by the year 2001. On the other hand, 37.7% of the respondents would like to see Ancaster grow more slowly, to reach a population of 18,200 to 19,300 people by the year 2001. There were some respondents (15.2%) who favoured a high growth rate of 33,200 to 38,200 people in Ancaster by the year 2001.

4.3.5 Hamilton Year 2001 Population

A moderate future population growth for Hamilton of 375,000 to 385,000 people and high growth to 395,000 people by the year 2001 were favoured by equal percentages, each with 39.5% of the Hamilton respondents. The low population of 355,000 was favoured by 20.5%.

4.3.6 Flamborough Year 2001 Population

A low population projection for Flamborough of 26,100 to 32,000 people by the year 2001 was favoured by the highest percent of the Flamborough respondents, namely 43.1%. On the other hand, 39.7% favoured a moderate population growth to 45,000 people, while 13.2% favoured a high population of 91,000 people for Flamborough by the year 2001.

4.4 Employment

4.4.1 Glanbrook Year 2001 Employment

Respondents were of mixed opinion regarding how many jobs they would like to see in Glanbrook by the year 2001. The highest percentage, 36.9%, would like to see moderate employment growth so that Glanbrook would have between 7,000 to 9,000 jobs by the year 2001. However, 24.8% of the respondents favoured a low employment growth of 3,000 to 5,000 jobs in Glanbrook by 2001. Another 22.7% favoured high employment growth in Glanbrook with 10,000 to 11,000 jobs by 2001. Furthermore, some respondents would like to have more than 11,000 jobs by 2001.

4.4.2 Dundas Year 2001 Employment

Over half of the respondents (57.4%) felt that a year 2001 employment figure of 6,500 jobs, as projected under all seven alternative Regional development patterns is acceptable for Dundas. However, approximately 13% felt this figure is too high while approximately 11% felt that this figure is too low.

4.4.3 Stoney Creek Year 2001 Employment

A moderate employment growth giving Stoney Creek 27,000 to 28,000 jobs by the year 2001 is favoured by the highest percentage of Stoney Creek respondents (42.5%). In addition, a high percentage of respondents (34%) favoured a high employment projection of 36,000 jobs for Stoney Creek. The low projection of 20,000 to

22,600 was favoured by 12.8%.

4.4.4. Ancaster Year 2001 Employment

Nearly equal percentages of Ancaster respondents chose the low employment projection of 4,700 to 4,900 jobs (39.4%) and the medium projection of 6,000 to 6,200 jobs (34.8%) for Ancaster by the year 2001. The high employment projection of 7,300 jobs was chosen by 18.2% of the respondents.

4.4.5. Hamilton Year 2001 Employment

The highest percentage of Hamilton respondents, 51.3% favoured the high employment projection for the City of Hamilton of between 238,700 to 239,800 jobs by the year 2001. The moderate employment growth figure of 236,500 was favoured by 25.6% of the respondents while the low employment projection of 234,000 to 235,400 jobs was favoured by 12.8% of the respondents.

4.4.6. Flamborough Year 2001 Employment

The medium year 2001 employment projection of 10,400 jobs for Flamborough was favoured by the highest number of Flamborough respondents, 43.7%. However, 36.2% of the respondents favoured a low projection of 5,700 to 7,000 jobs while 14.9% favoured the high projection of 17,300 jobs for Flamborough by the year 2001.

4.5 Industrial Development

Respondents from all the area municipalities in the Region except Dundas were in agreement with allocating some of the future industrial land required in the Region to each of their municipalities. Over 75% of the Flamborough respondents supported this concept while over 80% of the Ancaster, Glanbrook, Hamilton and Stoney Creek respondents agreed with it.

However, while 36.2% of the Dundas respondents favoured having some of the future industrial land required in the Region located in Dundas, over half (55.3%) did not want any additional land in Dundas developed for industrial use.

4.6 Retail-Office Centres

Nearly half of the Glanbrook (48.3%) and Flamborough (49.4%) respondents and over half of the respondents from Dundas (55.3%), Stoney Creek (57.5%), Ancaster (54.5%) and Hamilton (61.5%) were of the opinion that an attempt should be made to decentralize some of the future retail and office employment growth to centres other than Downtown Hamilton. Many respondents (from all the area municipalities) felt that retail-office centres should be established in each area municipality.

On the other hand, however, over 25% of the respondents from all the municipalities were opposed to decentralizing future retail-

office employment growth away from Downtown Hamilton. In addition, some indecision is evident among respondents from Glanbrook, Stoney Creek, Ancaster and Flamborough as reflected by their range of 17% to 20.7% "no response" on this issue.

4.7 Loss Of Prime Agricultural Land

The loss of up to 9,000 acres or 5% of all prime agricultural land in the Region due to future urban development was regarded as an acceptable loss by local respondents as follows:

Hamilton	33.3%
Dundas	42.6%
Ancaster	43.9%
Flamborough	52.3%
Glanbrook	58.2%
Stoney Creek	68.1%

Among the respondents who regarded such a loss of prime agricultural land as unacceptable, some favoured a loss of up to 4,000 acres. Others, however, felt that as little prime agricultural land as possible should be lost to future urbanization.

4.8 Amount of the Fruit Belt to Be Preserved

Total preservation of the Fruit Belt area for fruit growing was favoured by nearly half of the Glanbrook respondents (48.3%) and over half of the respondents from Dundas (68.1%), Ancaster (53.0%), Hamilton (64.1%) and Flamborough (59.8%).

In addition, over 25% of the respondents from each of these municipalities would like to see most of the Fruit Belt preserved for fruit growing but they would also favour allowing some development to take place.

Opinion among Stoney Creek respondents regarding the preservation of the Fruit Belt for fruit growing was split almost evenly among the following groups of respondents:

- 23.4% felt that all of the Fruit Belt should be preserved for fruit growing
- 25.5% felt that most of the Fruit Belt should be preserved for fruit growing but some development should be allowed
- 23.4% felt that while some of the Fruit Belt should be preserved for fruit growing, a major portion should be developed
- 21.3% felt that none of the Fruit Belt should be preserved for fruit growing

4.9 Regional Costs

A range of 41.1% to 53.8% of the respondents from the six area municipalities indicated they were willing to support more Regional costs than that of the Trend Alternative which is the cheapest of the seven alternatives to service (\$274 million). Most of the respondents were willing to support between 5% and 10% more in Regional Costs while some stated their willingness to support whatever costs are necessary to service the development pattern they prefer.

However, some indecision about this issue is evident among respondents from all the area municipalities. A range of 15.4% to 30.3% of the local respondents did not take a position on this issue.

4.10 Location of Expanded Airport

If an expanded airport facility was to be recommended for the Hamilton-Wentworth area, over 50% of the respondents from Glanbrook (56.7%) and Ancaster (50%), over 60% of the respondents from Dundas (66%) and Hamilton (64.1%) and over 70% of those from Stoney Creek (78.7%) and Flamborough (76.4%) would favour locating it at the present airport site at Mount Hope.

However, some respondents from Ancaster (21.2%), Dundas (12.7%) and Flamborough (12.1%) appeared to be undecided about this issue and did not reply to the question.

4.11 Landfill Sites

4.11.1 Locating a Landfill Site in Each Area Municipality

Response to the issue of locating a landfill site in each area municipality was mixed. Over 60% of the respondents from Stoney Creek (61.7%) and Hamilton (64.1%) agreed with having a landfill site located in their respective municipalities.

Also 48.9% of the Dundas respondents and 50% of the Flamborough respondents agreed with having such a site in their respective municipalities. However, significant percentages of the respondents from Dundas and Flamborough either disagreed with this proposal or did not take a position on this issue.

The highest percent of Glanbrook respondents (55.3%) were opposed to having a landfill site in their municipality. The remaining Glanbrook respondents were either in agreement with such a proposal (27.7%) or did not take a position on this issue (17%).

Among the Ancaster respondents, a nearly equal percentage of respondents were in agreement with having a landfill site in Ancaster (39.4%) as those who disagreed (37.4%). The remainder (22.7%) were undecided about this issue.

4.11.2 Service Area For Local Landfill Sites

A high percent of respondents from all the area municipalities (ranging from 15.4% to 25.8% of the respondents) were undecided about the issue of what area a local landfill site should serve. However, the highest percentages of respondents from all the municipalities felt that a local landfill site should serve their local municipality only. Some respondents were of the opinion that such a site should serve part of the Region in addition to their municipality.

5.0 ANALYSIS OF GLANBROOK QUESTIONNAIRE

5.1 The Development Pattern

5.1.1 The Housing Mix

Question

"A variety of housing types will be required in the future for the residents of the Region. Should each municipality provide such a variety (including rental housing) to meet the needs of all age and income groups?"

Results

Of the 141 respondents, 70.9% (Table A-1) were of the opinion that each municipality should provide a variety of housing types in the future, including rental housing, to meet the housing needs of all age and income groups.

Question

"Most residential development in Glanbrook is now single family housing. For future residential development, what type of housing mix would you like to see here?"

All single family

Mostly single family and some townhouses

Mostly single family, some townhouses, and some apartments

An equal mix of single family, townhouses, and apartments

Other"

Results

Referring to future residential development in Glanbrook, most respondents would like to see either all single family housing (35.5%) built in the township or single family housing with some townhouse development (31.2%). As indicated in Table A-2, 25.5% showed approval for some apartment development in addition to single family and townhouse development.

5.1.2 Preferred Regional Development Pattern

Question

"Which one of the following alternative Regional development patterns do you like the best?"

Results

Over 40% of the respondents, as indicated in Table A-3 favored the Conglomerate Alternative. The response to the remaining

six alternative Regional development patterns was scattered, with some preference being shown for the South Central (9.9%), the C.O.L.U.C. (7.1%) and Western (6.4%) Alternatives. In addition, 7.8% of the respondents stated that they did not like any of the alternatives while 16.3% did not respond to the question at all.

5.1.3 Proposed Glanbrook Local Official Plan

Question

"Do you agree with the development pattern that the Local Official Plan is proposing in Glanbrook?

If no, what pattern do you suggest?"

Results

The response to the proposed Glanbrook Official Plan was mixed as indicated in Table A-4. Approximately 55% of the respondents agreed with the proposed development pattern for Glanbrook. However, 25.5% disagreed with the proposal while the remaining 19.1% did not reply to the question.

Among those who disagreed with the proposal, some suggested that there should be less development of Binbrook and more growth in Mount Hope.

5.2 Development in the Rural Area

5.2.1 Rural Settlement Development

Question

"To minimize the adverse impacts of development on the natural resources and reduce the need for additional services and facilities, it is proposed that future residential development in the Rural Area be located mainly in existing settlement areas that have good potential for expansion. Do you agree?"

Results

As shown in Table A-5, the majority of respondents (72.3%) agreed that, in the Rural Area, future residential development should be confined to existing settlement areas that have good expansion potential.

5.2.2 Land Severances

Question

"Do you agree that in the Rural Area land severances for residential

purposes should be allowed on the following basis:

Discouraged in prime agricultural areas and considered on the basis of restrictive severance policies for agricultural purposes only.

Allowed in other than prime agricultural areas and considered on the basis of less restrictive severance policies."

Results

The response to restricting residential land severances in prime agricultural areas was mixed, as shown in Table A-6. While 46.8% of the respondents maintained that land severances on prime agricultural areas should be restricted for agricultural purposes only, another 22.7% disagreed, while the remaining 30.5% seemed to be undecided about this matter and did not answer this part of the question.

There seemed to be more agreement on the issue of allowing residential land severances in other than prime agricultural areas. Approximately 61% of the respondents (Table A-7) felt that less restrictive land severance policies should be established for these areas. However, there appears to be some indecision on this matter as well, since 22.7% of the respondents did not answer this part of the question.

5.3 Glanbrook 2001 Population

Question

"In 1971 the population of Glanbrook was 9,900 people. Under the seven alternatives there is a range of 15,000 to 22,000 people projected for Glanbrook. How many people would you like to see living in Glanbrook by the year 2001?

Low - 15,000

Medium - 20,000

High - 22,000

Other "

Results

Respondents were of mixed opinion regarding what population they would like to see in Glanbrook by the year 2001.

As Table A-8 shows 35.5% of the respondents favored a moderate growth rate over the next 25 years which would bring Glanbrook's population to 20,000 people.

However, there was also endorsement (28.3%) for a low future growth rate which would bring Glanbrook's year 2001 population to 15,000 people. In addition, a high growth rate which would give Glanbrook 22,000 people by the year 2001 was favored by 22% of the respondents.

Referring to the "other" category, some respondents would like to see more than 22,000 people living in Glanbrook by the year 2001.

Relating the population projections to the Alternative Regional Development Patterns, the Trend, Eastern, South Decentralized and Western Alternatives project a low year 2001 population of approximately 15,000 for Glanbrook. The South Central Alternative shows a moderate growth rate for Glanbrook of approximately 20,000 people by the year 2001. The Conglomerate Alternative, on the other hand, projects a high year 2001 population of 22,000 for Glanbrook.

5.4 Glanbrook 2001 Employment

Question

"In 1971 there were 1,500 jobs in Glanbrook. Under the seven alternatives there is a range of 3,000 to 11,000 jobs projected for Glanbrook for the year 2001. How many jobs would you like to see in Glanbrook by the year 2001?

Low - 3,000 to 5,000

Medium - 7,000 to 9,000

High - 10,000 to 11,000

Other "

Results

Respondents were also of mixed opinion regarding how many jobs they would like to see in Glanbrook by the year 2001. The highest percentage, 36.9% (Table A-9) would like to see moderate employment growth so that Glanbrook would have between 7,000 to 9,000 jobs by the year 2001.

However, 24.8% of the respondents favoured low employment projections of 3,000 to 5,000 jobs for Glanbrook by 2001. Another 22.7% favored high employment growth in Glanbrook with 10,000 to 11,000 jobs by 2001. Furthermore, some respondents would like Glanbrook to have more than 11,000 jobs by 2001.

Relating the year 2001 employment projections to the Alternative Regional Development Patterns, the Trend, Eastern, and Western Alternatives project low employment growth (3,000 to 5,000 jobs) for Glanbrook. A moderate employment growth for Glanbrook of 7,000 to 9,000 jobs is projected under the South Decentralized and Conglomerate Alternatives. The C.O.L.U.C. and South Central Alternatives, on the other hand, project a high employment projection for Glanbrook of 10,000 to 11,000 jobs.

5.5 Industrial Development

Question

"Are you in favour of having some of the industrial land required in the Region located in Glanbrook?"

Results

An overwhelming 85.8% of the respondents (Table A-10) were in favor of having some of the future industrial land required in the Region located in Glanbrook. Many respondents favored locating Glanbrook's industrial development south of the Hamilton Mountain Industrial Park. Some respondents were of the opinion that the industrial development should be located along or near the railway line in Glanbrook.

5.6 Retail-Office Centres

Question

"Downtown Hamilton will continue to be the prime Regional Centre providing the major retail-office employment. Do you feel an attempt should be made to decentralize some of the future retail and office employment growth to other centres in the Region?"

Results

As indicated in Table A-11, 48.3% of the respondents maintained that some of the future retail-office employment growth in the Region should be decentralized to centres other than Downtown Hamilton.

Many respondents felt that retail-office centres should be established in each area municipality. Binbrook and Mount Hope were identified as locations in Glanbrook for retail-office centres. In addition, some respondents favored the establishment of a retail-office centre on Hamilton Mountain.

5.7 Acceptable Loss of Prime Agricultural Land

Question

"Some prime agricultural land is lost under all seven alternative development patterns. Would you agree that the loss of up to 9,000 acres or 5% of all prime agricultural land in the Region for future urban development is acceptable?"

If no, what loss is acceptable?"

Results

Approximately 58% of the respondents (Table A-12) felt that a loss of 9,000 acres or 5% of all prime agricultural land in the Region due to future urban development is acceptable.

Among those who felt such a loss is unacceptable, some regarded a loss of between 4,000 to 5,000 (6.3%) as more acceptable. Some felt that as little prime agricultural land as possible should be lost to future urban development.

One must note that with a significant 14.9% "no response" to this question, there appears to be some indecision regarding what loss of prime agricultural land is acceptable.

5.8 Amount of Fruit Belt to be Preserved

Question

"Part of the Niagara Fruit Belt is located in the Town of Stoney Creek, east of Fruitland Road between the Escarpment and the Queen Elizabeth Way. It is an important tender fruit producing area and is the only one of its kind in the Region. How much of the Fruit Belt do you feel should be preserved for fruit growing?"

Results

Over 80% of the respondents maintained that all or most of the Fruit Belt should be preserved for fruit growing (Table A-13). Approximately 48% took the position that all of the Fruit Belt should be preserved, while 32.6% felt that most of it should be preserved, with some development being allowed. No respondents indicated that none of the Fruit Belt should be preserved.

5.9 Regional Costs

Question

"The Region will incur capital costs for sewer, water, solid waste disposal, and transportation facilities to service the Preferred Regional Development Pattern. The Trend Alternative is the cheapest alternative to service and will cost 274 million dollars. Compared to the Trend Alternative how much more in Regional costs are you willing to support to achieve the development pattern you prefer?"

Results

The question of supporting Regional costs was received with mixed feelings, as indicated by the high 27% "no response" shown in Table A-14.

Approximately 19% of the respondents stated they were not willing to support more Regional costs than that of the Trend Alternative (\$274 million) which is the cheapest alternative to service.

However, 41.1% were willing to support between 5% and 20% more

in Regional costs, with most favoring between 5% and 10%. Indeed, some respondents indicated their willingness to support whatever costs are required to service the development pattern they prefer.

5.10 Location of Expanded Airport

Question

"If an expanded airport facility was to be recommended for this area, where do you feel it should be located?

At the present site at Mount Hope

At another site in the Region

At a site nearby the Region

Other"

Results

Over half of the respondents (56.7%) felt that if an expanded airport facility is to be recommended for the Hamilton-Wentworth area, it should be located at the present site at Mount Hope (Table A-15). On the other hand, 14.9% suggested that it be located at a site nearby the Region. Several respondents mentioned locating it at Caistor Centre in the Region of Niagara.

5.11 Landfill Sites

5.11.1 Locating A Landfill Site in Glanbrook

Question

"Approximately 2,000 tons of solid waste are being produced each day in Hamilton-Wentworth. The existing Regional landfill sites will be filled to capacity within approximately two years so that a long-range solid waste disposal plan needs to be formulated. Such a plan would establish new landfill sites at locations having the least negative impact on the environment.

If such a landfill site(s) was identified in this municipality, would you agree to having it located here? If no, why not?"

Results

Table A-16 shows that 55.3% disagree with having a landfill site located in Glanbrook while 27.7% agree with it and the remaining 17% did not answer the question.

Among those who were against having a landfill site located in Glanbrook, many felt that alternative waste disposal methods should be utilized. Others felt that such a site should

not service the whole Region. Some were concerned with the traffic generated from a local landfill site while others were concerned with the pollution aspect.

5.11.2 Service Area for Local Landfill Site

Question

"What area do you feel a landfill site in your municipality should serve?

This municipality only

This municipality and part of the Region

All of the Region

Other "

Results

According to Table A-17, there is an even split between those who felt that a landfill site in Glanbrook should serve Glanbrook only (36.9%) and those who felt that it should serve part of the Region in addition to Glanbrook (36.9%). However, a significant 18.4% of the respondents seemed to be undecided about this issue and did not answer the question.

6.0 DUNDAS PUBLIC MEETING

6.1 The Development Pattern

6.1.1 The Housing Mix

Question

"A variety of housing types will be required in the future for the residents of the Region. Should each municipality provide such a variety (including rental housing) to meet the needs of all age and income groups?"

Results

Of the 47 respondents, 72.4% (Table B-1) felt that each municipality should provide a variety of housing types in the future including rental accommodation to meet the housing needs of all age and income groups.

Question

"Residential development in Dundas is now 73% single family, 4% townhouses, and 23% apartments. What type of housing mix would you like to see in Dundas in new residential areas?"

All single family

Mostly single family and some townhouses

Mostly single family, some townhouses, and some apartments

An equal mix of single family, townhouses, and apartments

Other"

Results

Referring to future residential development in Dundas, the highest percentage of respondents (36.2%) favoured a housing mix for Dundas of mostly single family family housing, with some townhouse and apartment development (Table B-2). An additional 19.1% of the respondents would like to see an equal mix of single family housing, townhouses, and apartments while another 19.1% favoured mostly single family with some townhouse development.

On the other hand, there was some support (12.8%) for providing all single family housing in Dundas.

6.1.2 Preferred Regional Development Pattern

Question

"Which one of the following alternative Regional development patterns do you like the best?"

Results

As indicated on Table B-3, the highest percentage of Dundas respondents (25.5%) preferred the South Decentralized Alternative, followed by those who favoured the C.O.L.U.C. (23.4%) and the South Central Alternatives (12.7%).

In addition, a significant number of respondents (14.9%) appeared to be undecided about which alternative they liked and did not answer this question at all.

6.2 Development in the Rural Area

6.2.1 Rural Settlement Development

Question

"To minimize the adverse impacts of development on the natural resources and reduce the need for additional services and facilities, it is proposed that future residential development in the Rural Area of the Region be located mainly in existing settlement areas that have good potential for expansion. Do you agree?"

Results

As Table B-4 shows, the majority of respondents (78.7%) agreed that, in the Rural Area future residential development should be confined to existing settlement areas that have good potential for expansion.

6.2.2 Land Severances

Question

"Do you agree that, in the Rural Area, land severances for residential purposes should be allowed on the following basis:

Discouraged in prime agricultural areas
and considered on the basis of restrictive
severance policies for agricultural
purposes only.

Allowed in other than prime agricultural
areas and considered on the basis of less
restrictive severance policies."

Results

As shown in Table B-5, 68.1% of the respondents agreed with restricting residential land severances in prime agricultural areas for agricultural purposes only. However, with 25.5% of the respondents not answering this part of the question, there appears to have been some indecision on this issue.

Nearby half of the respondents (46.8%) agreed with allowing residential land severances in other than prime agricultural areas through less restrictive severance policies. However, 27.7% of the respondents (Table B-6) disagreed with such a proposal. Another 25.5% did not answer this part of the question, suggesting some indecision on this issue as well.

6.3 Dundas 2001 Population

Question

"In 1971 the population of Dundas was 18,600 people. Under all seven alternative development patterns, a population of 21,000 people has been projected for the year 2001. Do you feel this population projection for Dundas is _____ acceptable.
_____ too high. What population do you suggest? _____
_____ too low. What population do you suggest? _____
_____ undecided."

Results

The majority of respondents, as shown in Table B-7 (61.7%) were of the opinion that a year 2001 population of 21,000 people for the Town of Dundas as projected under all seven alternative Regional development patterns was acceptable. However, 17.1% felt that this figure is too high while approximately 11% felt that it was too low and favoured a population of between 25,000 to 30,000 people.

6.4 Dundas 2001 Employment

Question

"In 1971 there were 4,600 jobs in Dundas. Under all seven alternative development patterns, we have projected an employment figure of 6,500 jobs for the year 2001. Do you feel this employment projection for Dundas is _____ acceptable.
_____ too high. How many jobs do you suggest? _____
_____ too low. How many jobs do you suggest? _____
_____ undecided."

Results

Over half of the respondents (57.4%) felt that a year 2001 employment figure of 6,500 jobs as projected under all seven alternative Regional development patterns is acceptable for Dundas. However, approximately 13% felt this figure is too high while approximately 11% felt that this figure is too low (Table B-8).

6.5 Industrial Development

Question

"None of the seven alternative development patterns propose any significant amount of new industrial land in Dundas beyond possible expansion of existing industries. Do you feel that some of the industrial land required in the Region should be located in Dundas?"

Results

Over half of the respondents (55.3%) did not want any additional land in Dundas developed for industrial use (Table B-9). Some felt that no suitable areas are left in Dundas for future industrial development. Others expressed the desire to keep Dundas small. Some were concerned about the high cost of servicing industrial land. In addition, some respondents felt existing industrial land could be more economically used.

However, 36.2% of the respondents felt that some of the future industrial land required in the Region should be located in Dundas. Some felt that the existing industrial areas could be expanded while others suggested locating industrial development in the York Road - Highway 99 area.

6.6 Retail-Office Centres

Question

"Downtown Hamilton will continue to be the prime Regional centre providing the major retail-office employment. Do you feel an attempt should be made to decentralize some of the future retail and office employment growth to other centres in the Region?"

Results

As indicated in Table B-10, 55.3% of the respondents maintained that some of the future retail-office employment growth in the Region should be decentralized to centres other than Downtown Hamilton. Many respondents favoured establishing retail-office centres in all the area municipalities. Many would also like to see some retail-office employment growth in Dundas. Some suggested locating it on the west mountain of Hamilton.

On the other hand, 36.2% of the respondents felt that future retail-office employment growth should not be decentralized away from Downtown Hamilton. Some felt that concentrated growth reduces costs. Others were concerned about keeping Dundas small.

6.7 Acceptable Loss of Prime Agricultural Land

Question

"All seven alternative development patterns will use up some prime agricultural land for future urban development. Would you agree that the loss of up to 9,000 acres or 5% of all prime agricultural land in the Region is acceptable?

If no, what loss is acceptable?"

Results

Approximately 43% of the respondents (Table B-11) agreed with a loss of up to 9,000 acres or 5% of all prime agricultural land in the Region for future urban development.

Among those who felt that such a loss is unacceptable, many did not specify what amount of loss they agreed with. A loss of 4,000 acres or less was regarded by a few as a more acceptable loss. Some felt that no prime agricultural land or as little as possible should be lost to future urban development.

6.8 Amount of Fruit Belt to be Preserved

Question

"Part of the Niagara Fruit Belt is located in the Town of Stoney Creek, east of Fruitland Road between the Escarpment and the Queen Elizabeth Way. It is an important tender fruit producing area and is the only one of its kind in the Region. How much of the Fruit Belt do you feel should be preserved for fruit growing?"

Results

Over 68% of the respondents (Table B-12) maintained that all of the Fruit Belt should be preserved for fruit growing. In addition 25.5% took the position that most of the Fruit Belt should be preserved for fruit growing, with some development being allowed. No one was of the opinion that none of the Fruit Belt should be preserved.

6.9 Regional Costs

Question

"The Region will incur capital costs for sewer, solid waste disposal, and transportation facilities to service the Preferred Regional Development Pattern. The Trend Alternative is the cheapest alternative to service and will cost 274 million dollars. Compared to the Trend Alternative how much more in Regional costs are you willing to support to achieve the development pattern your prefer?"

Results

Approximately 21% of the respondents (Table B-13) stated that they were not willing to support more Regional costs than that of the Trend Alternative (\$274 million) which is the cheapest alternative to service.

However, 46.8% indicated their willingness to support between 5% and 20% more in Regional costs. Approximately 15% indicated a willingness to support 5% more and 25.5% showed a willingness to support 10% more costs than the servicing costs of the Trend Alternative.

A high 19.1% "no response", however, suggests that many respondents were undecided about this issue.

6.10 Location of Expanded Airport

Question

"If an expanded airport facility was to be recommended for this area, where do you feel it should be located?

- At the present site at Mount Hope
- At another site in the Region
- At a site nearby the Region
- Other"

Results

Most of the Dundas respondents (66%) felt that if an expanded airport facility was to be recommended for the Hamilton-Wentworth area, it should be located at the present site at Mount Hope (Table B-14). However, some indecision regarding this issue is evident with 14.9% of the respondents choosing the "other" reply category and another 12.7% not responding to this question at all.

6.11 Landfill Sites

6.11.1 Locating A Landfill Site in Dundas

Question

"Approximately 2,000 tons of solid waste are being produced each day in Hamilton-Wentworth. The existing Regional landfill sites will be filled to capacity within approximately two years so that a long-range solid waste disposal plan needs to be formulated. Such a plan would establish new landfill sites at locations having the least negative impact on the environment.

If such a landfill site(s) was identified in this municipality, would you agree to having it located here?

If no, why not?"

Results

There was an almost equal split (Table B-15) between those who favour having a landfill site located in Dundas (48.9%) and those who disagree with locating one in Dundas (38.3%).

Among those who were against having a landfill site located in Dundas, some felt that Dundas has no suitable areas for such a site. Others would like to see alternatives to landfill being used for solid waste disposal.

6.11.2 Service Area for Local Landfill Site

Question

"What area do you feel a landfill site in your municipality should serve?
This municipality only
This municipality and part of the Region
All of the Region
Other"

Results

Approximately 36% of the respondents felt that a local landfill site should serve Dundas only (Table B-16). An additional 21.3% felt that such a landfill site should serve part of the Region in addition to Dundas.

A significant 23.3% of the respondents did not answer this question, suggesting that there is some indecision among respondents regarding this issue.

7.0 STONEY CREEK PUBLIC MEETING

7.1 The Development Pattern

7.1.1 The Housing Mix

Question

"A variety of housing types will be required in the future for the residents of the Region. Should each municipality provide such a variety (including rental housing) to meet the needs of all age and income groups?"

Results

There was strong agreement (89.3%) with the concept of each municipality providing a variety of housing types (including rental housing) in the future to meet the needs of all age and income groups (Table C-1).

Question

"Residential development in Stoney Creek is now 78% single family and doubles, 4% townhouses, and 18% apartments. What type of housing mix would you like to see in Stoney Creek in new residential areas?"

All single family

Mostly single family and some townhouses

Mostly single family, some townhouses, and some apartments

An equal mix of single family, townhouses, and apartments

Other"

Results

As indicated in Table C-2, 40.4% of the respondents would like future residential development in Stoney Creek to consist of mostly single family housing with some townhouse and apartment development. An additional 21.3% would like to see an equal mix of single family, townhouse and apartment development. However, 14.9% are in favor of having all single family residential development in Stoney Creek in the future.

7.1.2 Preferred Regional Development Pattern

Question

"Which one of the following alternative Regional development patterns do you like the best?"

Results

As Table C-3 shows, the Eastern Alternative was the preferred alternative by most of the respondents in Stoney Creek (46.8%).

Response to the remaining six alternatives was mixed. The Trend and South Central Alternatives were each preferred by an additional 12.8% of the respondents while the C.O.L.U.C. Alternative was preferred by 10.6% of the respondents.

7.2 Development in the Rural Area

7.2.1 Rural Settlement Development

Question

"To minimize the adverse impacts of development on the natural resources and reduce the need for additional services and facilities, it is proposed that future residential development in the Rural Area of the Region be located mainly in existing settlement areas that have good potential for expansion. Do you agree?"

Results

The majority of respondents (72.3%) agreed that, in the Rural Area future residential development should be located mainly in existing settlement areas that have good potential for expansion (Table C-4). However, there appears to be some indecision on the issue as reflected by a significant 19.1% of the respondents not replying to this question.

7.2.2 Land Severances

Question

"Do you agree that, in the Rural Area, land severances for residential purposes should be allowed on the following basis:
Discouraged in prime agricultural areas and considered on the basis of restrictive severance policies for agricultural purposes only.

Allowed in other than prime agricultural areas and considered on the basis of less restrictive severance policies."

Results

Response to restricting residential land severances in prime agricultural areas was mixed, as indicated in Table C-5. There were nearly equal percentages of respondents who agreed (38.3%) and who disagreed (31.9%) with restricting land severances in prime agricultural areas for agricultural purposes only. There appears to have been some indecision regarding this issue as reflected by a 29.8% "no response" to this part of the question.

There was more agreement (63.8%) with allowing land severances in other than prime agricultural areas, through less restrictive severance policies (Table C-6). Nonetheless, there was

still a high (23.4%) "no response" to this part of the question, suggesting that respondents had not made up their minds on this issue.

7.3 Stoney Creek 2001 Population

Question

"In 1971 the population of Stoney Creek was 27,400 people. Under the seven alternatives a range of 49,100 to 114,000 people is projected for Stoney Creek. How many people would you like to see living in Stoney Creek by the year 2001?

Low - 49,100

Medium - 70,100 to 76,500

High - 114,000

Other "

Results

As shown in Table C-7 the highest percentage of the Stoney Creek respondents (42.5%) favored a moderate population growth for Stoney Creek which would give it a population of 70,100 to 76,500 people by the year 2001. On the other hand, 31.9% of the respondents endorsed the high population projection of 114,000 people for the year 2001. The low population projection of 49,000 people was favored by only 10.7%.

Relating the population projections for Stoney Creek to the seven Alternative Regional Development Patterns, the low projection of 49,100 is reflected by the Western Alternative. The moderate projection figures of 70,100 to 76,500 refer to those given for Stoney Creek under the Trend, C.O.L.U.C., South Central, South Decentralized, and Conglomerate Alternatives. The high population projection of 114,000, on the other hand, is allocated to Stoney Creek under the Eastern Alternative.

7.4 Stoney Creek 2001 Employment

Question

"In 1971 there were 6,900 jobs in Stoney Creek. Under the seven alternatives a range of 20,100 to 36,000 jobs is projected for Stoney Creek. How many jobs would you like to see in Stoney Creek by the year 2001?

Low - 20,100 to 22,600

Medium - 27,000 to 28,500

High - 36,000

Other "

Results

A moderate employment growth giving Stoney Creek 27,000 to

28,000 jobs by the year 2001 is favored by the highest percentage of respondents (42.5%), as indicated in Table C-8. In addition, a high percentage of respondents (34%) favored a high employment projection of 36,000 jobs for Stoney Creek. The low projection of 20,000 to 22,600 was favored by 12.8%.

Relating the employment projections for Stoney Creek to the seven Alternative Regional Development Patterns, the low projections of 20,100 to 22,600 jobs refer to those given to Stoney Creek under the C.O.L.U.C., South Central, and Western Alternatives. The moderate employment projections of 27,000 to 28,500 jobs for Stoney Creek refer to those given under the Trend, South Decentralized, and Conglomerate Alternatives. The Eastern Alternative, on the other hand, gives Stoney Creek a high projection of 36,000 jobs.

7.5 Industrial Development

Question

"Are you in favor of having some of the industrial land required in the Region located in Stoney Creek?"

Results

A high 83% of the respondents (Table C-9) were in favor of having some of the future industrial land required in the Region located in Stoney Creek. Many respondents favored locating Stoney Creek's future industrial development between the Q.E.W. on the south and either Barton Street or the railway tracks on the north. Various eastern boundaries for this industrial development were suggested but there was no consensus on this issue.

Approximately 15% of the respondents were opposed to providing more industrial land in Stoney Creek. However, the reasons given for this point of view were not conclusive.

7.6 Retail-Office Centres

Question

"Downtown Hamilton will continue to be the prime Regional centre providing the major retail-office employment. Do you feel an attempt should be made to decentralize some of the future retail and office employment growth to other centres in the Region?"

Results

Approximately 57% of the respondents (Table C-10) were of the opinion that an attempt should be made to decentralize some of the future retail-office employment growth to centres other

than Downtown Hamilton.

Some respondents felt that retail-office centres should be established in all the area municipalities. Others felt that some or even all of the future retail-office employment growth should be located in Stoney Creek. Some maintained that centres should be located where they are needed while others suggested that centres should be located near residential areas.

Among the 25.5% who disagreed with decentralizing future retail-office employment growth, some felt that with energy becoming a problem, an attempt should be made to concentrate employment to make public transit more viable. Others felt that Downtown Hamilton has all the facilities and should remain the centre of business.

7.7 Acceptable Loss of Prime Agricultural Land

Question

"All seven alternative development patterns will use up some prime agricultural land for future urban development. Would you agree that the loss of up to 9,000 acres or 5% of all prime agricultural land in the Region is acceptable?"

If no, what loss is acceptable?"

Results

As indicated in Table C-11, 68.1% of the respondents felt that the loss of up to 9,000 acres or 5% of all prime agricultural land in the Region due to future urban developemnt is acceptable.

Among those who felt that such a loss is unacceptable, there was no consensus regarding what amount of loss would be more acceptable.

7.8 Amount of Fruit Belt to be Preserved

Question

"Part of the Niagara Fruit Belt is located in the Town of Stoney Creek, east of Fruitland Road between the Escarpment and the Queen Elizabeth Way. It is an important tender fruit producing area and is the only one of its kind in the Region. How much of the Fruit Belt do you feel should be preserved for fruit growing?"

Results

Opinion among Stoney Creek respondents regarding the issue of preserving the Fruit Belt for fruit growing was split almost evenly

among the following groups of respondents (Table C-12):

- . 23.4% felt that all of the Fruit Belt should be preserved for fruit growing,
- . 25.5% felt that most of the Fruit Belt should be preserved for fruit growing but some development should be allowed,
- . 23.4% felt that while some of the Fruit Belt should be preserved for fruit growing, a major portion should be developed,
- . 21.3% felt that none of the Fruit Belt should be preserved for fruit growing.

7.9 Regional Costs

Question

"The Region will incur capital costs for sewer, solid waste disposal, and transportation facilities to service the Preferred Regional Development Pattern. The Trend Alternative is the cheapest alternative to service and will cost 274 million dollars. Compared to the Trend Alternative how much more in Regional costs are you willing to support to achieve the development pattern you prefer?"

Results

As Table C-13 shows, 17% of the respondents indicated they were not willing to support more Regional costs than that of the Trend Alternative (\$274 million) which is the cheapest alternative to service. However, 44.8% indicated their willingness to support between 5% and 20% more in Regional costs.

Some respondents indicated they were willing to support whatever costs are necessary to service the development pattern they prefer. However, some indecision regarding this issue is evident due to the high 23.4% "no response" to this question.

7.10 Location of Expanded Airport

Question

"If an expanded airport facility was to be recommended for this area, where do you feel it should be located?"

At the present site at Mount Hope
At another site in the Region
At a site nearby the Region
Other "

Results

Over 78% of the respondents (Table C-14) maintained that if an expanded airport facility is to be recommended for the Hamilton-Wentworth area, it should be located at the present site at Mount Hope.

7.11 Landfill Sites

7.11.1 Locating A Landfill Site in Stoney Creek

Question

"Approximately 2,000 tons of solid waste are being produced each day in Hamilton-Wentworth. The existing Regional landfill sites will be filled to capacity within approximately two years so that a long-range solid waste disposal plan needs to be formulated. Such a plan would establish new landfill sites at locations having the least negative impact on the environment.

If such a landfill site(s) was identified in this municipality, would you agree to having it located here?

If no, why not?"

Results

Over 61% of the respondents (Table C-15) agreed with having a landfill site located in Stoney Creek. Among those who disagreed (25.5%), some felt that alternative methods of solid waste disposal should be used.

7.11.2 Service Area for Local Landfill Site

Question

"What area do you feel a landfill site in your municipality should serve?

This municipality only

This municipality and part of the Region

All of the Region

Other "

Results

As indicated in Table C-16, 53.2% of the respondents felt that a landfill site in Stoney Creek should only serve Stoney Creek. However, 17% felt that such a site should serve a part of the Region in addition to Stoney Creek, while another 10.6% felt that it should serve the entire Region.

8.0 ANCASTER PUBLIC MEETING

8.1 The Development Pattern

8.1.1 Housing Mix

Question

"A variety of housing types will be required in the future for the residents of the Region. Should each municipality provide such a variety (including rental housing) to meet the needs of all age and income groups?"

Results

Over 74% of the respondents (Table D-1) were of the opinion that each municipality should provide a variety of housing types (including rental housing) to meet the needs in the future of all age and income groups.

Question

"Residential development in Ancaster is now 96% single family, 1% townhouses, and 3% apartments. What type of housing mix would you like to see in Ancaster in new residential areas?"

- a. All single family
- b. Mostly single family and some townhouses
- c. Mostly single family, some townhouses, and some apartments
- d. An equal mix of single family, townhouses, and apartments
- e. Other"

Results

The highest percentage of respondents, 45.5%(Table D-2), would like future residential development in Ancaster to consist of mostly single family housing with some townhouse and some apartment development.

However, 28.8% of the respondents favored a future housing mix of mostly single family housing and some townhouses. An additional 13.6% favored the future building of all single family housing in Ancaster.

8.1.2 The Preferred Regional Development Pattern

Question

"Which one of the following alternative Regional development patterns do you like the best?"

Results

As indicated in Table D-3, the South Central Alternative was

the preferred alternative by the highest percentage of Ancaster respondents (30.3%). The South Decentralized Alternative was preferred by the next highest percentage (13.6%) followed by the Western Alternative which was favored by 12.1%. In addition, 10.6% of the Ancaster respondents chose the Conglomerate Alternative.

One must note that 9.1% of the Ancaster respondents did not like any of the seven Alternative Regional Development Patterns. In addition, some respondents appeared undecided about their choice, as reflected in the 9.1% "no response" to the question.

8.2 Development in the Rural Area

8.2.1 Rural Settlement Development

Question

"To minimize the adverse impacts of development on the natural resources and reduce the need for additional services and facilities, it is proposed that future residential development in the Rural Area of the Region be located mainly in existing settlement areas that have good potential for expansion. Do you agree?"

Results

Over 83% of the respondents (Table D-4) agreed that, in the Rural Area future residential development should be located mainly in existing settlement areas that have good potential for expansion.

8.2.2 Land Severances

Question

"Do you agree that, in the Rural Area, land severances for residential purposes should be allowed on the following basis:

- a. Discouraged in prime agricultural areas and considered on the basis of restrictive severance policies for agricultural purposes only.
- b. Allowed in other than prime agricultural areas and considered on the basis of less restrictive severance policies."

Results

There appears to be some indecision regarding the issue of restricting land severances in prime agricultural areas. This indecision is reflected by the 22.7% "no response" to this part of the question. However, 68.2% of the respondents (Table D-5) agreed that land severances should be restricted in prime agricultural areas, for agricultural purposes only.

There was also some indecision regarding the issue of having less restrictive land severance policies in other than prime agricultural areas. A high 31.8% did not respond to this part of the question. However, 53% of the respondents (Table D-6) agreed with allowing land severances in these areas on the basis of less restrictive severance policies.

8.3 Ancaster 2001 Population

Question

"In 1971 the population of Ancaster was 15,200 people. Under the seven alternatives a range of 18,200 to 38,200 people is projected for Ancaster. How many people would you like to see living in Ancaster by the year 2001?

Low - 18,200 to 19,300

Medium - 23,500

High - 33,200 to 38,200

Other "

Results

As shown in Table D-7, the highest percent of Ancaster respondents (42.4%) favored a moderate future population growth in Ancaster to 23,500 people by the year 2001. On the other hand, 37.9% of the respondents would like Ancaster to grow slowly to reach a population of between 18,200 to 19,300 people by the year 2001.

Relating the population projection for Ancaster to the seven Alternative Regional Development Patterns, the low projection figures of 18,200 to 19,300 are reflected in the Eastern, South Central, and Western Alternatives. The moderate population growth figure of 23,500 refers to that under the C.O.L.U.C. and Conglomerate Alternatives. The high population projections of 33,200 to 38,200 which 15.2% of the Ancaster respondents favored, refer to those under the Trend and South Decentralized Alternatives.

8.4 Ancaster 2001 Employment

Question

"In 1971 there were 2,000 jobs in Ancaster. Under the seven alternatives a range of 4,700 to 7,300 jobs is projected for Ancaster. How many jobs would you like to see in Ancaster by the year 2001?

Low - 4,700 to 4,900

Medium - 6,000 to 6,200

High - 7,300

Other "

Results

Nearly equal percentages of Ancaster respondents (Table D-8)

chose the low year 2001 employment projection of 4,700 to 4,900 jobs for Ancaster (39.4%) and the medium projection of 6,000 to 6,200 jobs (34.8%). The high employment projection of 7,300 jobs was chosen by 18.2% of the respondents.

Relating these employment projections to the seven Alternative Regional Development Patterns, the low projection figures of 4,700 to 4,900 jobs are those allocated to Ancaster under the Eastern, C.O.L.U.C., and South Central Alternatives. The medium projection figures of 6,000 to 6,200 jobs were given to Ancaster under the Trend, Western, and Conglomerate Alternatives, while the South Decentralized Alternative used the high year 2001 employment projection of 7,300 jobs for Ancaster.

8.5 Industrial Development

Question

"Are you in favor of having some of the future industrial land required in the Region located in Ancaster?"

Results

As indicated in Table D-9, 94% of the Ancaster respondents were in favor of having some of the future industrial land required in the Region located in Ancaster. Many respondents would like to see this industrial development located in the area of Highways #2 and #53.

8.6 Retail-Office Centres

Question

"Downtown Hamilton will continue to be the prime Regional centre providing the major retail-office employment. Do you feel an attempt should be made to decentralize some of the future retail and office employment growth to other centres in the Region?"

Results

Over 54% of the respondents (Table D-10) were of the opinion that an attempt should be made to decentralize some of the future retail-office employment growth to centres other than Downtown Hamilton.

Some respondents would like to see retail-office centres established in all of the area municipalities. Some felt that such a centre should be located in Ancaster. Others would like to see a centre located on Hamilton Mountain.

However, approximately 26% of the respondents disagreed with the concept of decentralizing retail-office employment growth.

Some respondents felt that the Region needs a vital downtown core to attract such growth and that decentralization might weaken Downtown Hamilton's position as the regional centre.

8.7 Acceptable Loss of Prime Agricultural Land

Question

"All seven alternative development patterns will use up some prime agricultural land for future urban development. Would you agree that the loss of up to 9,000 acres or 5% of all prime agricultural land in the Region is acceptable?

If no, what loss is acceptable? "

Results

The loss of up to 9,000 acres or 5% of all prime agricultural land in the Region due to future urban development was considered acceptable by approximately 44% of the Ancaster respondents (Table D-11).

Some respondents (13.7%) who felt such a loss is unacceptable were more in favor of a loss of 4,000 acres. However, the high 21.2% "no response" to this question suggests that many respondents were undecided on this issues.

8.8 Amount of Fruit Belt to be Preserved

Question

"Part of the Niagara Fruit Belt is located in the Town of Stoney Creek, east of Fruitland Road between the Escarpment and the Queen Elizabeth Way. It is an important tender fruit producing area and is the only one of its kind in the Region. How much of the Fruit Belt do you feel should be preserved for fruit growing?"

Results

As shown in Table D-12, 53% of the respondents would like to see all of the Fruit Belt area preserved for fruit growing. An additional 27.3% would like to see most of the Fruit Belt area preserved for fruit growing with some development being allowed. However, it would appear that some respondents were undecided about this issue since 16.7% did not answer this question.

8.9 Regional Costs

Question

"The Region will incur capital costs for sewer, solid waste disposal, and transportation facilities to service the Preferred Regional Development

Pattern. The Trend Alternative is the cheapest alternative to service and will cost 274 million dollars. Compared to the Trend Alternative how much more in Regional costs are you willing to support to achieve the development pattern you prefer?"

Results

Over 19% of the respondents (Table D-13) stated they were not willing to support more Regional costs than that of the Trend Alternative which is the cheapest alternative to service. On the other hand, 43.9% indicated their willingness to support between 5% and 20% more in Regional costs, with most of these respondents selecting 5% to 10% more.

However, some indecision about this issue is evident from the high 30.3% who did not respond to this question.

8.10 Location of Expanded Airport

Question

"If an expanded airport facility was to be recommended for this area, where do you feel it should be located?

At the present site at Mount Hope

At another site in the Region

At a site nearby the Region

Other "

Results

The question of where to locate an expanded airport, if such a facility is to be recommended for the Hamilton-Wentworth area, received a mixed response.

As indicated in Table D-14, 50% of respondents favored locating an expanded airport at the present airport site, at Mount Hope. However, the remainder of respondents had mixed feelings about this issue, with 21.2% not responding to this question at all and 18.2% selecting the "other" location category. Some of these respondents were of the opinion that an expanded airport was not needed.

8.11 Landfill Sites

8.11.1 Locating A Landfill Site in Ancaster

Question

"Approximately 2,000 tons of solid waste are being produced each day in Hamilton-Wentworth. The existing Regional landfill sites will be filled to capacity within approximately two years so that a long-range solid waste disposal plan needs to be formulated. Such a plan would establish

new landfill sites at locations having the least negative impact on the environment.

If such a landfill site(s) was identified in this municipality, would you agree to having it located here?

If not, why not?

Results

Response to the issue of locating a landfill site in Ancaster was mixed. As shown in Table D-15, 39.4% of the Ancaster respondents agreed with having a landfill site located in Ancaster, while 37.9% disagreed with such a proposal and an additional 22.7% did not answer the question.

Among those who disagreed with having a landfill site in Ancaster, many felt that there must be alternative ways to dispose of solid wastes. Some respondents were concerned with the pollution that might result from such a site.

8.11.2 Service Area for Local Landfill Site

Question

"What area do you feel a landfill site in your municipality should serve?
This municipality only
This municipality and part of the Region
All of the Region
Other "

Results

As indicated in Table D-16, 51.5% of the respondents maintained that a landfill site in Ancaster should only serve Ancaster. There was a group of respondents, 16.7%, who felt that such a site could serve a part of the Region in addition to Ancaster. There was also some indecision regarding the issue, as reflected by the 25.8% "no response" to this question.

9.0 HAMILTON PUBLIC MEETINGS

9.1 The Development Pattern

9.1.1 The Housing Mix

Question

"A variety of housing types will be required in the future for the residents of the Region. Should each municipality provide such a variety (including rental housing) to meet the needs of all age and income groups?"

Results

Of the 39 Hamilton respondents, 92% (Table E-1) were of the opinion that a variety of housing types, including rental accommodation should be provided in each area municipality in the future to meet the needs of all age and income groups in the Region.

Question

"Residential development in Hamilton is now 58% single family and doubles, 10% townhouses, and 32% apartments. What type of housing mix would you like to see in Hamilton in new residential areas?"

All single family

Mostly single family and some townhouses

Mostly single family, some townhouses, and some apartments

An equal mix of single family, townhouses, and apartments

Other "

Results

As indicated in Table E-2, 41% of the respondents would like future residential development in Hamilton to be made up of mostly single family housing with some townhouse and apartment development. However, 15.4% preferred an equal mix of single family, townhouse, and apartment development for Hamilton.

Another, 15.4% favored the future development of only single family housing in the City.

9.1.2 Preferred Regional Development Pattern

Question

"Which one of the following alternative Regional development patterns do you like the best?"

Results

Three alternatives, namely the C.O.L.U.C. (20.5%), the South

Central (17.9%) and the South Decentralized (23.1%) were the preferred alternatives by most of the Hamilton respondents (Table E-3). However, some respondents appeared to be undecided about their preference, as reflected by the 12.8% "no response" to this question.

9.1.3 High Density Residential Corridors in Hamilton

Question

"Under the C.O.L.U.C. and South Central Alternatives, high density residential corridors are proposed in some areas of Hamilton to encourage more use of public transit. Are you in favor of redevelopment in the following areas to accommodate a higher population density?

On the Mountain along Upper James and Upper Wellington Streets (C.O.L.U.C. and South Central)

Along Main and King Streets between Downtown and Highway 403 (C.O.L.U.C.)

Along Main Street West between Highway 8 and the City limits (C.O.L.U.C.)"

Results

Response was mixed to the concept of redeveloping some areas in the City of Hamilton into high density residential corridors, as indicated in Table E-4.

A nearly equal percentage of Hamilton respondents (48.7%) were in favor of establishing a high density residential corridor on Hamilton Mountain, along Upper James and Upper Wellington Streets, as those who were opposed to the proposal (41%).

A similar response was received to the proposal of establishing a high density residential corridor along Main and King Streets, between Downtown Hamilton and Highway 403. While 46.7% were in favor of such a proposal, 33.3% disagreed and the remaining 20.5% did not give a reply.

A mixed response was also given to the proposal of establishing such a corridor along Main Street West, between Highway 8 and the City limits. The response to this proposal was inconclusive, with 43.6% of the respondents favoring it, 35.9% opposing it, and 20.5% not stating their position.

9.2 Development in the Rural Area

9.2.1 Rural Settlement Development

Question

"To minimize the adverse impacts of development on the natural resources and reduce the need for additional services and facilities, it is proposed that future residential development in the Rural Area of the Region be located mainly in existing settlement areas that have good potential for expansion. Do you agree?"

Results

Over 87% of the Hamilton respondents (Table E-5) were of the opinion that future residential development in the Rural Area should be located mainly in existing settlement areas with good potential for expansion.

9.2.2 Land Severances

Question

"Do you agree that, in the Rural Area, land severances for residential purposes should be allowed on the following basis:

Discouraged in prime agricultural areas and considered on the basis of restrictive severance policies for agricultural purposes only

Allowed in other than prime agricultural areas and considered on the basis of less restrictive severance policies."

Results

Approximately 80% of the respondents (Table E-6) agreed that land severances should be discouraged in prime agricultural areas and allowed on the basis of restrictive policies for agricultural purposes only. There was some indecision regarding this issue, with 15.4% of the respondents not stating their position.

While 56.4% of the respondents (Table E-7) were in agreement with establishing less restrictive severance policies in other than prime agricultural areas, 23.1% disagreed with this proposal. The remaining 20.5% did not state their position.

9.3 Hamilton 2001 Population

Question

"In 1971 the population of Hamilton was 309,200 people. Under the seven alternatives a range of 355,000 to 395,000 people is projected for Hamilton. How many people would you like to see living in Hamilton by the year 2001?

Low - 355,000

Medium - 375,000 to 385,000

High - 395,000

Other "

Results

A moderate future population growth for Hamilton, giving it 375,000 to 385,000 people, and a high growth to 395,000 people by the year 2001 were favored by equal percentages, each with 39.5% of the Hamilton respondents (Table E-8). The low population projection of 355,000 was favored by 20.5%.

Relating the population projections for Hamilton to the seven Alternative Regional Development Patterns, the low projection of 355,000 is reflected in the Eastern and Western Alternatives. The medium projection figures of 375,000 to 385,000 refer to those under the Trend, South Decentralized and Conglomerate Alternatives while the high projection figure of 395,000 is reflected by the C.O.L.U.C. and South Central Alternatives.

9.4 Hamilton 2001 Employment

Question

"In 1971 there were 138,500 jobs in Hamilton. Under the seven alternatives a range of 234,000 to 239,800 jobs is projected for Hamilton. How many jobs would you like to see in Hamilton by the year 2001?

Low - 234,000 to 235,000

Medium - 236,500

High - 238,700 to 239,800

Other "

Results

The highest percentage of Hamilton respondents, 51.3% (Table E-9) favored the high employment projection for the City of Hamilton of between 238,700 to 239,800 jobs by the year 2001. These employment figures are reflected in Trend, C.O.L.U.C., and South Central Alternatives.

The moderate employment growth figure of 236,500, which refers to the Western Alternative, was favored by 25.6% of the respondents. The low employment projection of 234,000 to 235,400 jobs which refers to the Eastern, South Decentralized and Conglomerate Alternatives, was favored by 12.8% of the respondents.

9.5 Industrial Development

Question

"Are you in favor of having some of the future industrial land required in the Region located in Hamilton?"

Results

As indicated in Table E-10, 87.2% of the Hamilton respondents favored locating some of the future industrial land required in the Region in Hamilton. Many of these respondents would like to see this industrial development located in the Hamilton Mountain Industrial Park.

9.6 Retail-Office Centres

Question

"Downtown Hamilton will continue to be the prime Regional centre providing the major retail-office employment. Do you feel an attempt should be made to decentralize some of the future retail and office employment growth to other centres in the Region?"

Results

Over 61% of the respondents (Table E-11) were of the opinion that an attempt should be made to decentralize some of the future retail-office employment growth to centres other than Downtown Hamilton. Many respondents would like to see some of this growth directed to the Hamilton Mountain. Others feel that each municipality should receive some of the retail-office employment growth.

However, 35.9% of the respondents were opposed to decentralizing some of this growth away from Downtown Hamilton. Various reasons were given for this position but they were inconclusive.

9.7 Acceptable Loss of Prime Agricultural Land

Question

"All seven alternative development patterns will use up some prime agricultural land for future urban development. Would you agree that the loss of up to 9,000 acres or 5% of all prime agricultural land in the Region is acceptable?

If no, what loss is acceptable?"

Results

Over 33% of the Hamilton respondents (Table E-12) were of the opinion that the loss of up to 9,000 acres or 5% of all prime agricultural land in the Region due to future urban development was acceptable.

However, 59% regarded this loss as unacceptable, with over 15% maintaining that as little prime agricultural land as possible should be lost to future urbanization.

9.8 Amount of the Fruit Belt to be Preserved

Question

"Part of the Niagara Fruit Belt is located in the Town of Stoney Creek, east of Fruitland Road between the Escarpment and the Queen Elizabeth Way. It is an important tender fruit producing area and is the only one of its kind in the Region. How much of the Fruit Belt do you feel should be preserved for fruit growing?"

As Table E-15 indicated, 64.1% of the respondents felt that if an expanded airport is to be recommended for the Hamilton-Wentworth area, it should be located at the present airport site at Mount Hope. A few respondents were of the opinion that no airport expansion is needed.

9.11 Landfill Sites

9.11.1 Locating A Landfill Site in Hamilton

Question

"Approximately 2,000 tons of solid waste are being produced each day in Hamilton-Wentworth. The existing Regional landfill sites will be filled to capacity within approximately two years so that a long-range solid waste disposal plan needs to be formulated. Such a plan would establish new landfill sites at locations having the least negative impact on the environment.

If such a landfill site(s) was identified in this municipality, would you agree to having it located here?

If no, why not?"

Results

Over 64% of the Hamilton respondents (Table E-16) agreed with having a landfill site located in the City of Hamilton. However, 25.6% disagreed with such a proposal but did not give specific reasons for their disagreement.

9.11.2 Service Area for Local Landfill Site

Question

"What area do you feel a landfill site in your municipality should serve?

This municipality only

This municipality and part of the Region

All of the Region

Other "

Results

As shown in Table E-17, response to the issue of what area of the Region a landfill site in Hamilton should serve, was mixed. While 30.8% of the responses favored having a local landfill site serve Hamilton only, another 25.6% felt it should serve part of the Region in addition to Hamilton. Another 28.2% felt that such a site should serve the entire Region.

10.0 FLAMBOROUGH PUBLIC MEETINGS

10.1 The Development Pattern

10.1.1 The Housing Mix

Question

"A variety of housing types will be required in the future for the residents of the Region. Should each municipality provide such a variety (including rental housing) to meet the needs of all age and income groups?"

Results

Over 71% of the Flamborough respondents (Table F-1) were of the opinion that each municipality should provide a variety of housing types in the future including rental housing to meet the needs of all age and income groups in the Region.

Question

"Residential development in Flamborough is now 84% single family and doubles, 1% townhouses and 15% apartments. What type of housing mix would you like to see in Flamborough in new residential areas?"

All single family

Mostly single family and some townhouses

Mostly single family, some townhouses, and some apartments

An equal mix of single family, townhouses, and apartments

Other"

Results

As indicated in Table F-2, the response was mixed to the question dealing with type of future housing mix favored for Flamborough. While 21.9% of the respondents favored the development of all single family housing, 31.6% would like to see mostly single family housing and some townhouse development in Flamborough. On the other hand, 29.3% of the respondents showed a preference for mostly single family housing with some of both townhouse and apartment development.

10.1.2 The Preferred Regional Development Pattern

Question

"Which one of the following alternative Regional development patterns do you like the best?"

Results

The Conglomerate Alternative was the Alternative Regional Development Pattern preferred by the highest percent of the

Flamborough respondents, 19.5% (Table F-3). The Western Alternative followed, with 16.1% of the respondents indicating their preference for it. In addition, the South Central and C.O.L.U.C. Alternatives were chosen as a preferred alternative by 11.5% and 10.9% of the respondents respectively.

One must note that 12.1% of the respondents did not prefer any of the alternatives and an additional 12.7% did not respond to the question at all.

10.1.3 Agreement with Proposed Flamborough Official Plan

Question

"Do you agree with the development pattern that the Local Official Plan is proposing for Flamborough?

If no, what pattern do you suggest?"

Results

Over 44% of the Flamborough respondents (Table F-4) agreed with the development pattern that is proposed by the Official Plan for Flamborough. However, 35.1% disagreed with the proposal and the remaining 20.1% did not take a position regarding this proposal.

Among those who disagreed with the proposed development pattern for Flamborough, many made suggestions regarding what pattern they would like to see. These suggestions have been forwarded to Flamborough's planning consultants.

Question

"Do you agree with the provision of Waterdown as a heritage village?

If no, why not?"

Results

Over 74% of the Flamborough respondents (Table F-5) agreed with the proposal to make Waterdown a heritage village. However, disagreement with the proposal was shown by 14.9% of the respondents, with some giving reasons for their disagreement. Their comments have been forwarded to Flamborough's planning consultants.

Moreover, some respondents appeared to be undecided about this issue, as reflected by the 10.9% "no response" to this question.

10.2 Development in the Rural Area

10.2.1 Rural Settlement Development

Question

"To minimize the adverse impacts of development on the natural resources and reduce the need for additional services and facilities, it is proposed that future residential development in the Rural Area be located mainly in existing settlement areas that have good potential for expansion. Do you agree?"

Results

As Table F-6 indicated, 73.6% of the Flamborough respondents were of the opinion that future residential development in the Rural Area should be located mainly in existing settlement areas that have good potential for expansion.

10.2.2 Land Severances

Question

"On what basis should land severances for residential purposes be allowed on prime agricultural land? (Choose one)
for agricultural purposes only
for farm retirement and sons and daughters of farmers
Other

Do you agree that land severances for residential purposes should be allowed in other than prime agricultural areas on the basis of less restrictive severances policies?"

Results

The highest percent of Flamborough respondents, 53.5% (Table F-7) were of the opinion that residential land severances on prime agricultural land should be allowed for farm retirement, and sons and daughters of farmers. However, 21.3% felt that residential land severances in such areas should be permitted for agricultural purposes only. There was a group of respondents (19.5%) who felt that residential severances in such areas should be allowed for other purposes than agricultural, farm retirement, and sons and daughters of farmers.

As Table F-8 indicated, over 79% of the Flamborough respondents agreed that residential land severances in other than prime agricultural areas should be allowed on the basis of less restrictive severance policies.

10.3 Flamborough 2001 Population

Question

"In 1971 the population of Flamborough was 21,000 people. Under the Regional alternatives and the Draft Local Official Plan, there is a range of 26,100 to 91,000 people projected for Flamborough. How many people would you like to see living in Flamborough by the year 2001?

Low - 26,100 to 32,000

Medium - 45,000

High - 91,000

Other "

Results

A low population projection for Flamborough of 26,100 to 32,000 people by the year 2001 was favored by the highest percent of the Flamborough respondents, namely 43.1% (Table F-9). On the other hand, 39.7% favored a moderate population growth to 45,000 people, while 13.2% favored a high population of 91,000 people for Flamborough by the year 2001.

Relating the population projections for Flamborough to the seven Alternative Regional Development Patterns, the low projection figures of 26,100 to 32,000 are reflected by the Trend, Eastern, C.O.L.U.C., South Central, South Decentralized and Conglomerate Alternatives. The Western Alternative, on the other hand, has allocated the high projection of 91,000 people to Flamborough. The medium population projection of 45,000 has been identified under the proposed Local Official Plan.

10.4 Flamborough 2001 Employment

Question

"In 1971 there were 3,400 jobs in Flamborough. Under the Regional alternatives and the Draft Local Official Plan, there is a range of 5,800 to 17,300 jobs projected for Flamborough for the year 2001. How many jobs would you like to see in Flamborough by the year 2001?

Low - 5,700 to 7,000

Medium - 10,400

High - 17,300

Other "

Results

The medium year 2001 employment projection of 10,400 jobs for Flamborough was favored by the highest number of Flamborough respondents, 43.7% (Table F-10). However, 36.2% of the respondents favored a low projection of 5,700 to 7,000 jobs while 14.9% favored the high projection of 17,300 jobs for Flamborough by the year 2001.

Relating these employment projections for Flamborough to the seven Alternative Regional Development Patterns, the low projection figures of 5,700 to 7,000 jobs are those allocated to Flamborough

by the Trend, Eastern, C.O.L.U.C., South Central, South Decentralized, and Conglomerate Alternatives. The Western Alternatives, on the other hand, has allocated the high projection of 17,300 jobs to Flamborough. The proposed Local Official Plan identified a figure of 10,400 jobs for Flamborough, giving it a medium employment growth compared to the Regional Alternatives.

10.5 Industrial Development

Question

"Are you in favor of having some of the future industrial land required in the Region located in Flamborough?"

Results

Over 77% of the respondents (Table F-11) favored locating some of the future industrial land required in the Region in Flamborough.

Many respondents would like the industrial development in Flamborough located along and at the junction of Highways #5 and #6. Some stressed that it should be located on poor agricultural or non-agricultural lands, while others suggested it be located near main roads and services.

There were some respondents who felt such development in Flamborough should be located along the CPR tracks, while others would like it located in the Waterdown area. A number of respondents supported the location of the industrial land as identified in the proposed Local Official Plan.

Most respondents who commented on what type of industrial development they would like to see in Flamborough favored light, non-polluting industries.

There was 14.9% of the respondents who did not want industrial development in Flamborough. Some of these people felt that Flamborough should be kept rural. Others were concerned with the lack of available services for this type of development.

10.6 Retail-Office Centres

Question

"Downtown Hamilton will continue to be the prime Regional centre providing the major retail-office employment. Do you feel an attempt should be made to decentralize some of the future retail and office employment growth to other centres in the Region?"

Results

As indicated in Table F-12, 49.4% of the respondents were of the opinion that an attempt should be made to decentralize some of the future retail-office employment growth to centres other than Downtown Hamilton.

Many respondents suggested that centres should be established throughout the Region, in all the area municipalities. Many felt that some of the retail-office employment growth in the Region should be directed to Flamborough and particularly to Waterdown. A few people suggested that centres be established in suburban and rural areas where workers live. A suggestion was made that such centres be established in industrial parks. A general comment made was that such centres should be established wherever they can reasonably locate and where people can support them.

However, 29.9% of the Flamborough respondents were opposed to the decentralization of retail-office employment away from Downtown Hamilton. The remaining 20.7% were undecided about this issue. Among those respondents who were opposed to the decentralization, some felt that centralization was more economically efficient. Others felt that decentralized growth encourages urban sprawl. There were some respondents who felt that it is more attractive for potential offices to be located in the Downtown Hamilton area where there is an established business centre.

10.7 Acceptable Loss of Prime Agricultural Land

Question

"All seven alternative development patterns will use up some prime agricultural land for future urban development. Would you agree that the loss of up to 9,000 acres or 5% of all prime agricultural land in the Region is acceptable?"

If no, what loss is acceptable?"

Results

Approximately 53% of the Flamborough respondents (Table F-13) were of the opinion that the loss of up to 9,000 acres or 5% of all prime agricultural land in the Region for future urban development was acceptable.

However, 35.6% regarded this loss as unacceptable, with 5.7% maintaining that a loss of up to 4,000 acres would be more acceptable. As well, 3.4% felt that as little prime agricultural land as possible should be lost, while 5.2% felt that no

prime agricultural land should be lost to future urban development.

There was some indecision, however, regarding what loss of prime agricultural land is acceptable, as indicated by the 12.1% "no response" to this question.

10.8 Amount of the Fruit Belt to be Preserved

Question

"Part of the Niagara Fruit Belt is located in the Town of Stoney Creek, east of Fruitland Road between the Escarpment and the Queen Elizabeth Way. It is an important tender fruit producing area and is the only one of its kind in the Region. How much of the Fruit Belt do you feel should be preserved for fruit growing?"

Results

As shown in Table F-14, approximately 60% of the respondents felt that all of the Fruit Belt should be preserved for fruit growing. An additional 25.3% would like to see most of the Fruit Belt preserved for fruit growing, with some development being allowed.

10.9 Regional Costs

Question

"The Region will incur capital costs for sewer, solid waste disposal, and transportation facilities to service the Preferred Regional Development Pattern. The Trend Alternative is the cheapest alternative to service and will cost 274 million dollars. Compared to the Trend Alternative how much more in Regional costs are you willing to support to achieve the development pattern you prefer?"

Results

Approximately 29% of the Flamborough respondents (Table F-15) indicated that they were unwilling to support more Regional costs than that of the Trend Alternative (\$274 million) which is the cheapest alternative of the seven alternatives to service.

However, 46% stated that to achieve the development pattern they prefer, they would be willing to support more in Regional costs than those of the Trend Alternative. Most of these people are willing to support between 5% and 10% more in Regional costs.

Nonetheless, some indecision about this issue is evident as reflected by the 20.1% "no response" to the question.

10.10 Location of Expanded Airport

Question

"If an expanded airport facility was to be recommended for this area, where do you feel it should be located?

At the present site at Mount Hope

At another site in the Region

At a site nearby the Region

Other "

Results

As Table F-16 indicated, 76.4% of the respondents felt that if an expanded airport facility is to be recommended for the Hamilton-Wentworth area, it should be located at the present airport site at Mount Hope. However, there was some indecision regarding this issue, with 12.1% not taking a position on it.

10.11 Landfill Sites

10.11.1 Locating A Landfill Site in Flamborough

Question

"Approximately 2,000 tons of solid waste are being produced each day in Hamilton-Wentworth. The existing Regional landfill sites will be filled to capacity within approximately two years so that a long-range solid waste disposal plan needs to be formulated. Such a plan would establish new landfill sites at locations having the least negative impact on the environment.

If such a landfill site(s) was identified in this municipality, would you agree to having it located here? If no, why not?"

Results

While 50% of the respondents (Table F-17) agreed with having a landfill site located in Flamborough, 28.2% disagreed with such a proposal and the remaining 21.8% did not respond to this question.

Among those who disagreed with having a landfill site located in Flamborough, many were of the opinion that alternatives to landfill as a method of solid waste disposal should be utilized.

10.11.2 Service Area for Local Landfill Site

Question

"What area do you feel a landfill site in your municipality should serve?

This municipality only.
This municipality and part of the Region
All of the Region
Other "

Results

As indicated in Table F-18, 54% of the Flamborough respondents felt that a landfill site in Flamborough should serve Flamborough only. Another 20.1%, on the other hand, felt that such a landfill site should serve part of the Region in addition to Flamborough.

However, there appears to be some indecision regarding this issue as reflected by the 19% "no response" to the question.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - TABULAR RESULTS OF GLANBROOK QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B - TABULAR RESULTS OF DUNDAS QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX C - TABULAR RESULTS OF STONEY CREEK QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX D - TABULAR RESULTS OF ANCASTER QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX E - TABULAR RESULTS OF HAMILTON QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX F - TABULAR RESULTS OF FLAMBOROUGH QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX A - TABULAR RESULTS OF GLANBROOK QUESTIONNAIRE

TABULAR RESULTS OF GLANBROOK QUESTIONNAIRE

A. The Development Pattern

TABLE A-1

PROVISION OF HOUSING VARIETY IN EACH MUNICIPALITY

YES	100	70.9%
NO	34	24.1%
NO RESPONSE	7	5.0%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

TABLE A-2

TYPE OF FUTURE HOUSING MIX FAVOURED FOR GLANBROOK

ALL SINGLE FAMILY	50	35.5%
MOSTLY SINGLE FAMILY & SOME TOWNHOUSES	44	31.2%
MOSTLY SINGLE FAMILY, SOME TOWNHOUSES & SOME APARTMENTS	21	14.9%
AN EQUAL MIX OF SINGLE FAMILY, TOWNHOUSES & APARTMENTS	15	10.6%
OTHER	5	3.5%
NO RESPONSE	6	4.0%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

TABLE A-3

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PATTERN

TREND	6	4.3%
EASTERN	5	3.5%
C.O.L.U.C.	10	7.1%
SOUTH CENTRAL	14	9.9%
SOUTH DECENTRALIZED	6	4.3%
WESTERN	9	6.4%
CONGLOMERATE	57	40.4%
NONE	11	7.8%
NO RESPONSE	23	16.3%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

TABLE A-4

AGREEMENT WITH PROPOSED GLANBROOK LOCAL OFFICIAL PLAN

YES	78	55.4%
NO	36	25.5%
NO RESPONSE	27	19.1%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

B. Development in the Rural Area

TABLE A-5

RURAL SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT

AGREE	102	72.3%
DISAGREE	19	13.5%
NO RESPONSE	20	14.2%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

TABLE A-6

RESTRICTION OF LAND SEVERANCES IN PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREAS

AGREE	66	46.8%
DISAGREE	32	22.7%
NO RESPONSE	43	30.5%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

TABLE A-7

LESS RESTRICTION OF LAND SEVERANCES IN OTHER THAN
PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREAS

AGREE	87	61.7%
DISAGREE	22	15.6%
NO RESPONSE	32	22.7%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

C. Population

TABLE A-8

2001 GLANBROOK POPULATION

LOW (15,000)	40	28.3%
MEDIUM (20,000)	50	35.5%
HIGH (22,000)	31	22.0%
OTHER	7	5.0%
NO RESPONSE	13	9.2%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

D. Employment

TABLE A-9

2001 GLANBROOK EMPLOYMENT

LOW (3,000 to 5,000)	35	24.8%
MEDIUM (7,000 to 9,000)	52	36.9%
HIGH (10,000 to 11,000)	32	22.7%
OTHER	8	5.7%
NO RESPONSE	14	9.9%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

E. Industrial Development

TABLE A-10

LOCATION OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN GLANBROOK

YES	121	85.8%
NO	10	7.1%
NO RESPONSE	10	7.1%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

F. Retail-Office Centres

TABLE A-11

DECENTRALIZATION OF RETAIL-OFFICE CENTRES

YES	68	48.3%
NO	47	33.3%
NO RESPONSE	26	18.4%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

G. Agriculture

TABLE A-12

ACCEPTABLE LOSS OF PRIME AGRICULTURAL LAND

YES	82	58.2%
NONE	0	0.0%
1,000 OR LESS	1	.7%
UP TO 2,000	2	1.4%
UP TO 3,000	0	0.0%
UP TO 4,000	4	2.8%
UP TO 5,000	5	3.5%
UP TO 6,000	1	.7%
UP TO 7,000	1	.7%
UP TO 8,000	0	0.0%
AS LITTLE AS POSSIBLE	5	3.5%
UNSPECIFIED NO	19	13.6%
NO RESPONSE	21	14.9%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

H. The Fruit Belt

TABLE A-13

AMOUNT OF FRUITBELT TO BE PRESERVED

ALL	68	48.3%
MOST	46	32.6%
SOME	11	7.8%
NONE	0	0.0%
NO RESPONSE	16	11.3%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

I. Costs

TABLE A-14

WILLINGNESS TO SUPPORT MORE REGIONAL COSTS THAN
COSTS OF TREND ALTERNATIVE (\$274 MILLION)

NO MORE	27	19.1%
5% MORE	18	12.8%
10% MORE	24	17.0%
15% MORE	5	3.5%
20% MORE	11	7.8%
OTHER	18	12.8%
NO RESPONSE	38	27.0%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

J. Airport

TABLE A-15

LOCATION OF EXPANDED AIRPORT

PRESENT SITE AT MOUNT HOPE	80	56.7%
ANOTHER SITE IN REGION	12	8.5%
SITE NEAR REGION	21	14.9%
OTHER	16	11.4%
NO RESPONSE	12	8.5%
TOTAL	141	100.0%

K. Landfill Sites

TABLE A-16

AGREEMENT WITH LOCATING LANDFILL SITE IN LOCAL MUNICIPALITY

YES	39	27.7%
NO	78	55.3%
NO RESPONSE	<u>24</u>	<u>17.0%</u>
TOTAL	141	100.0%

TABLE A-17

SERVICE AREA FOR LOCAL LANDFILL SITE

LOCAL MUNICIPALITY ONLY	52	36.9%
LOCAL MUNICIPALITY & PART OF THE REGION	52	36.9%
ENTIRE REGION	7	5.0%
OTHER	4	2.8%
NO RESPONSE	<u>26</u>	<u>18.4%</u>
TOTAL	141	100.0%

APPENDIX B - TABULAR RESULTS OF DUNDAS QUESTIONNAIRE

TABULAR RESULTS OF DUNDAS QUESTIONNAIRE

A. The Development Pattern

TABLE B-1

PROVISION OF HOUSING MIX IN EACH MUNICIPALITY

YES	34	72.4%
NO	8	17.0%
NO RESPONSE	5	10.6%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

TABLE B-2

TYPE OF HOUSING MIX FAVOURED FOR DUNDAS

ALL SINGLE FAMILY	6	12.8%
MOST SINGLE FAMILY & SOME TOWNHOUSES	9	19.1%
MOSTLY SINGLE FAMILY, SOME TOWNHOUSES & SOME APARTMENTS	17	36.2%
AN EQUAL MIX OF SINGLE FAMILY, TOWNHOUSES & APARTMENTS	9	19.1%
OTHER	3	6.4%
NO RESPONSE	3	6.4%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

TABLE B-3

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PATTERN

TREND	2	4.3%
EASTERN	3	6.4%
C.O.L.U.C.	11	23.4%
SOUTH CENTRAL	6	12.7%
SOUTH DECENTRALIZED	12	25.5%
WESTERN	3	6.4%
CONGLOMERATE	1	2.1%
NONE	2	4.3%
NO RESPONSE	<u>7</u>	<u>14.9%</u>
TOTAL	47	100.0%

B. Development In The Rural Area

TABLE B-4

RURAL SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT

AGREE	37	78.7%
DISAGREE	3	6.4%
NO RESPONSE	<u>7</u>	<u>14.9%</u>
TOTAL	47	100.0%

TABLE B-5

RESTRICTION OF LAND SEVERANCES IN PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREAS

AGREE	32	68.1%
DISAGREE	3	6.4%
NO RESPONSE	<u>12</u>	<u>25.5%</u>
TOTAL	47	100.0%

TABLE B-6

LESS RESTRICTION OF LAND SEVERANCES IN OTHER THAN
PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREAS

AGREE	22	46.8%
DISAGREE	13	27.7%
NO RESPONSE	12	25.5%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

C. Population

TABLE B-7

2001 DUNDAS POPULATION PROJECTION (21,000)

ACCEPTABLE	29	61.7%
TO HIGH	0	0.0%
TO LOW	1	2.0%
UNDECIDED	2	4.3%
LESS THAN 18,600	2	4.3%
18,600	3	6.4%
19,000 TO 21,000	3	6.4%
25,000	2	4.3%
26,000 TO 30,000	3	6.4%
NO RESPONSE	2	4.3%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

D. Employment

TABLE B-8

2001 DUNDAS EMPLOYMENT PROJECTION (6,500)

ACCEPTABLE	27	57.4%
TOO HIGH	1	2.1%
TOO LOW	1	2.1%
UNDECIDED	4	8.5%
4,600 OR LESS	3	6.4%
5,000 TO 5,999	3	6.4%
6,000 TO 6,999	2	4.3%
7,000 TO 7,999	2	4.3%
8,000 to 9,000	1	2.1%
NO RESPONSE	<u>3</u>	<u>6.4%</u>
TOTAL	47	100.0%

E. Industrial Development

TABLE B-9

LOCATION OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN DUNDAS

YES	17	36.2%
NO	26	55.3%
NO RESPONSE	<u>4</u>	<u>8.5%</u>
TOTAL	47	100.0%

F. Retail-Office Centres

TABLE B-10

DECENTRALIZATION OF RETAIL-OFFICE CENTRES

YES	26	55.3%
NO	17	36.2%
NO RESPONSE	<u>4</u>	<u>8.5%</u>
TOTAL	47	100.0%

G. Agriculture

TABLE B-11

ACCEPTABLE LOSS OF PRIME AGRICULTURAL LAND

YES (9,000 ACRES)	20	42.6%
NONE	1	2.1%
1,000 OR LESS	1	2.1%
UP TO 2,000	0	0.0%
UP TO 3,000	0	0.0%
UP TO 4,000	3	6.4%
UP TO 5,000	0	0.0%
UP TO 6,000	0	0.0%
UP TO 7,000	0	0.0%
UP TO 8,000	0	0.0%
AS LITTLE AS POSSIBLE	1	2.1%
UNSPECIFIED NO	15	31.9%
NO RESPONSE	<u>6</u>	<u>12.8%</u>
TOTAL	47	100.0%

H. The Fruitbelt

TABLE B-12

AMOUNT OF FRUITBELT TO BE PRESERVED

ALL	32	68.1%
MOST	12	25.5%
SOME	1	2.1%
NONE	0	0.0%
NO RESPONSE	2	4.3%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

I. Costs

TABLE B-13

WILLINGNESS TO SUPPORT MORE REGIONAL COSTS THAN
COSTS OF TREND ALTERNATIVE (\$274 MILLION)

NO MORE	10	21.3%
5% MORE	7	14.9%
10% MORE	12	25.5%
15% MORE	0	0.0%
20% MORE	3	6.4%
OTHER	6	12.8%
NO RESPONSE	9	19.1%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

J. Airport

TABLE B-14

LOCATION OF EXPANDED AIRPORT

PRESENT SITE AT MOUNT HOPE	31	66.0%
ANOTHER SITE IN REGION	0	0.0%
SITE NEAR REGION	3	6.4%
OTHER	7	14.9%
NO RESPONSE	6	12.7%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

K. Landfill Sites

TABLE B-15

AGREEMENT WITH LOCATING LANDFILL SITE IN LOCAL MUNICIPALITY

YES	23	48.9%
NO	18	38.3%
NO RESPONSE	6	12.8%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

TABLE B-16

SERVICE AREA FOR LOCAL LANDFILL SITE

LOCAL MUNICIPALITY ONLY	17	36.2%
LOCAL MUNICIPALITY & PART OF REGION	10	21.3%
ENTIRE REGION	3	6.4%
OTHER	6	12.8%
NO RESPONSE	11	23.3%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

APPENDIX C - TABULAR RESULTS OF STONEY CREEK QUESTIONNAIRE

TABULAR RESULTS OF STONEY CREEK QUESTIONNAIRE

A. The Development Pattern

TABLE C-1

PROVISION OF HOUSING VARIETY IN EACH MUNICIPALITY

YES	42	89.3%
NO	2	4.3%
NO RESPONSE	3	6.4%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

TABLE C-2

TYPE OF FUTURE HOUSING MIX FAVOURED FOR STONEY CREEK

ALL SINGLE FAMILY	7	14.9%
MOSTLY SINGLE FAMILY & SOME TOWNHOUSES	4	8.5%
MOSTLY SINGLE FAMILY, SOME TOWNHOUSES & SOME APARTMENTS	19	40.4%
AN EQUAL MIX OF SINGLE FAMILY, TOWNHOUSES & APARTMENTS	10	21.3%
OTHER	4	8.5%
NO RESPONSE	3	6.4%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

TABLE C-3

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PATTERN

TREND	6	12.8%
EASTERN	22	46.8%
C.O.L.U.C.	5	10.6%
SOUTH CENTRAL	6	12.8%
SOUTH DECENTRALIZED	3	6.4%
WESTERN	1	2.1%
CONGLOMERATE	0	0.0%
NONE	1	2.1%
NO RESPONSE	3	6.4%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

B. Development in the Rural Area

TABLE C-4

RURAL SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT

AGREE	34	72.3%
DISAGREE	4	8.5%
NO RESPONSE	9	19.1%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

TABLE C-5

RESTRICTION OF LAND SEVERANCES IN PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREAS

AGREE	18	38.3%
DISAGREE	15	31.9%
NO RESPONSE	14	29.8%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

TABLE C-6

LESS RESTRICTION OF LAND SEVERANCES IN OTHER THAN
PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREAS

AGREE	30	63.8%
DISAGREE	6	12.8%
NO RESPONSE	<u>11</u>	<u>23.4%</u>
TOTAL	47	100.0%

C. Population

TABLE C-7

2001 STONEY CREEK POPULATION

LOW (49,100)	5	10.7%
MEDIUM (70,100 to 76,500)	23	48.9%
HIGH (114,000)	15	31.9%
OTHER	1	2.1%
NO RESPONSE	<u>3</u>	<u>6.4%</u>
TOTAL	47	100.0%

D. Employment

TABLE C-8

2001 STONEY CREEK EMPLOYMENT

LOW (20,100 to 22,600)	6	12.8%
MEDIUM (27,000 to 28,500)	20	42.5%
HIGH (36,000)	16	34.0%
OTHER	2	4.3%
NO RESPONSE	<u>3</u>	<u>6.4%</u>
TOTAL	47	100.0%

E. Industrial Development

TABLE C-9

LOCATION OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN STONEY CREEK

YES	39	83.0%
NO	7	14.9%
NO RESPONSE	1	2.1%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

F. Retail-Office Centres

TABLE C-10

DECENTRALIZATION OF RETAIL-OFFICE CENTRES

YES	27	57.5%
NO	12	25.5%
NO RESPONSE	8	17.0%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

G. Agriculture

TABLE C-11

ACCEPTABLE LOSS OF PRIME AGRICULTURAL LAND

YES (9,000 ACRES)	32	68.1%
NONE	2	4.3%
1,000 OR LESS	1	2.1%
UP TO 2,000	1	2.1%
UP TO 3,000	2	4.3%
UP TO 4,000	0	0.0%
UP TO 5,000	1	2.1%
UP TO 6,000	0	0.0%
UP TO 7,000	0	0.0%
UP TO 8,000	0	0.0%
AS LITTLE AS POSSIBLE	0	0.0%
UNSPECIFIED NO	6	12.7%
NO RESPONSE	2	4.3%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

H. The Fruit Belt

TABLE C-12

AMOUNT OF FRUITBELT TO BE PRESERVED

ALL	11	23.4%
MOST	12	25.5%
SOME	11	23.4%
NONE	10	21.3%
NO RESPONSE	3	6.4%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

I. Costs

TABLE C-13

WILLINGNESS TO SUPPORT MORE REGIONAL COSTS THAN
COSTS OF TREND ALTERNATIVE (\$274 MILLION)

NO MORE	8	17.0%
5% MORE	6	12.8%
10% MORE	6	12.8%
15% MORE	6	12.8%
20% MORE	3	6.4%
OTHER	7	14.9%
NO RESPONSE	11	23.4%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

J. Airport

TABLE C-14

LOCATION OF EXPANDED AIRPORT

PRESENT SITE AT MOUNT HOPE	37	78.7%
ANOTHER SITE IN REGION	1	2.1%
SITE NEAR REGION	3	6.4%
OTHER	3	6.4%
NO RESPONSE	<u>3</u>	<u>6.4%</u>
TOTAL	47	100.0%

K. Landfill Sites

TABLE C-15

AGREEMENT WITH LOCATING LANDFILL SITE IN LOCAL MUNICIPALITY

YES	29	61.7%
NO	12	25.5%
NO RESPONSE	<u>6</u>	<u>12.8%</u>
TOTAL	47	100.0%

TABLE C-16

SERVICE AREA FOR LOCAL LANDFILL SITE

LOCAL MUNICIPALITY ONLY	25	53.2%
LOCAL MUNICIPALITY & PART OF THE REGION	8	17.0%
ENTIRE REGION	5	10.6%
OTHER	2	4.3%
NO RESPONSE	<u>7</u>	<u>14.9%</u>
TOTAL	47	100.0%

APPENDIX C - TABULAR RESULTS OF ANCASTER QUESTIONNAIRE

TABULAR RESULTS OF ANCASTER QUESTIONNAIRE

A. The Development Pattern

TABLE D-1

PROVISION OF HOUSING VARIETY IN EACH MUNICIPALITY

YES	49	74.2%
NO	12	18.2%
NO RESPONSE	5	7.6%
TOTAL	66	100.0%

TABLE D-2

TYPE OF FUTURE HOUSING MIX FAVOURED FOR ANCASTER

ALL SINGLE FAMILY	9	13.6%
MOSTLY SINGLE FAMILY & SOME TOWNHOUSES	19	28.8%
MOSTLY SINGLE FAMILY, SOME TOWNHOUSES & SOME APARTMENTS	30	45.5%
AN EQUAL MIX OF SINGLE FAMILY, TOWNHOUSES & APARTMENTS	4	6.1%
OTHER	3	4.5%
NO RESPONSE	1	1.5%
TOTAL	66	100.0%

TABLE D-3

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PATTERN

TREND	3	4.6%
EASTERN	2	3.0%
C.O.L.U.C.	5	7.6%
SOUTH CENTRAL	20	30.3%
SOUTH DECENTRALIZED	9	13.6%
WESTERN	8	12.1%
CONGLOMERATE	7	10.6%
NONE	6	9.1%
NO RESPONSE	6	9.1%
TOTAL	66	100.0%

B. Development in the Rural Area

TABLE D-4

RURAL SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT

AGREE	55	83.3%
DISAGREE	7	10.6%
NO RESPONSE	4	6.1%
TOTAL	66	100.0%

TABLE D-5

RESTRICTION OF LAND SEVERANCES IN PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREAS

AGREE	45	68.2%
DISAGREE	15	9.1%
NO RESPONSE	6	22.7%
TOTAL	66	100.0%

TABLE D-6

LESS RESTRICTION OF LAND SEVERANCES IN OTHER THAN
PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREAS

AGREE	35	53.0%
DISAGREE	10	15.2%
NO RESPONSE	21	31.8%
TOTAL	66	100.0%

C. Population

TABLE D-7

2001 ANCASTER POPULATION

LOW (18,200 TO 19,300)	25	37.9%
MEDIUM (23,500)	28	42.4%
HIGH (33,200 to 38,200)	10	15.2%
OTHER	2	3.0%
NO RESPONSE	1	1.5%
TOTAL	66	100.0%

D. Employment

TABLE D-8

2001 ANCASTER EMPLOYMENT

LOW (4,700 TO 4,900)	26	39.4%
MEDIUM (6,000 TO 6,200)	23	34.8%
HIGH (7,300)	12	18.2%
OTHER	4	6.1%
NO RESPONSE	1	1.5%
TOTAL	66	100.0%

E. Industrial Development

TABLE D-9

LOCATION OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN ANCASTER

YES	62	94.0%
NO	2	3.0%
NO RESPONSE	2	3.0%
TOTAL	66	100.0%

F. Retail-Office Centres

TABLE D-10

DECENTRALIZATION OF RETAIL-OFFICE CENTRES

YES	36	54.5%
NO	17	25.8%
NO RESPONSE	13	19.7%
TOTAL	66	100.0%

G. Agriculture

TABLE D-11

ACCEPTABLE LOSS OF PRIME AGRICULTURAL LAND

YES (9,000 ACRES)	29	43.9%
NONE	0	0.0%
1,000 OR LESS	1	1.5%
UP TO 2,000	1	1.5%
UP TO 3,000	2	3.0%
UP TO 4,000	9	13.7%
UP TO 5,000	3	4.6%
UP TO 6,000	0	0.0%
UP TO 7,000	0	0.0%
UP TO 8,000	0	0.0%
AS LITTLE AS POSSIBLE	2	3.0%
UNSPECIFIED NO	5	7.6%
NO RESPONSE	14	21.2%
TOTAL	66	100.0%

H. The Fruit Belt

TABLE D-12

AMOUNT OF FRUITBELT TO BE PRESERVED

ALL	35	53.0%
MOST	18	27.3%
SOME	2	3.0%
NONE	0	0.0%
NO RESPONSE	<u>11</u>	<u>16.7%</u>
TOTAL	66	100.0%

I. Costs

TABLE D-13

WILLINGNESS TO SUPPORT MORE REGIONAL COSTS THAN
COSTS OF TREND ALTERNATIVE (\$274 MILLION)

NO MORE	13	19.7%
5% MORE	13	19.7%
10% MORE	10	15.1%
15% MORE	1	1.5%
20% MORE	5	7.6%
OTHER	4	6.1%
NO RESPONSE	<u>20</u>	<u>30.3%</u>
TOTAL	66	100.0%

J. Airport

TABLE D-14

LOCATION OF EXPANDED AIRPORT

PRESENT SITE AT MOUNT HOPE	33	50.0%
ANOTHER SITE IN REGION	1	1.5%
SITE NEAR REGION	6	9.1%
OTHER	12	18.2%
NO RESPONSE	14	21.2%
TOTAL	66	100.0%

K. Landfill Sites

TABLE D-15

AGREEMENT WITH LOCATING LANDFILL SITE IN LOCAL MUNICIPALITY

YES	26	39.4%
NO	25	37.9%
NO RESPONSE	15	22.7%
TOTAL	66	100.0%

TABLE D-16

SERVICE AREA FOR LOCAL LANDFILL SITE

LOCAL MUNICIPALITY ONLY	34	51.5%
LOCAL MUNICIPALITY & PART OF THE REGION	11	16.7%
ENTIRE REGION	3	4.5%
OTHER	1	1.5%
NO RESPONSE	17	25.8%
TOTAL	66	100.0%

APPENDIX E - TABULAR RESULTS OF HAMILTON QUESTIONNAIRE

TABULAR RESULTS OF HAMILTON QUESTIONNAIRE

A. The Development Pattern

TABLE E-1

PROVISION OF HOUSING VARIETY IN EACH MUNICIPALITY

YES	36	92.3%
NO	3	7.7%
NO RESPONSE	0	0.0%
TOTAL	39	100.0%

TABLE E-2

TYPE OF FUTURE HOUSING MIX FAVOURED FOR HAMILTON

ALL SINGLE FAMILY	6	15.4%
MOSTLY SINGLE FAMILY & SOME TOWNHOUSES	5	12.8%
MOSTLY SINGLE FAMILY, SOME TOWNHOUSES & SOME APARTMENTS	16	41.0%
AN EQUAL MIX OF SINGLE FAMILY, TOWNHOUSES & APARTMENTS	6	15.4%
OTHER	6	15.4%
NO RESPONSE	0	0.0%
TOTAL	39	100.0%

TABLE E-3

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PATTERN

TREND	3	7.7%
EASTERN	2	5.1%
C.O.L.U.C.	8	20.5%
SOUTH CENTRAL	7	17.9%
SOUTH DECENTRALIZED	9	23.1%
WESTERN	1	2.6%
CONGLOMERATE	1	2.6%
NONE	3	7.7%
NO RESPONSE	5	12.8%
TOTAL	<u>39</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

TABLE E-4

REDEVELOPMENT IN HAMILTON FOR HIGH DENSITY

RESIDENTIAL CORRIDORS

	YES		NO		NO RESPONSE		TOTAL	
ALONG UPER JAMES & UPPER WELLINGTON STREETS	19	48.7%	16	41.0%	4	10.3%	39	100.0%
ALONG MAIN & KING STREETS BETWEEN DOWNTOWN & HWY. #403	18	46.2%	13	33.3%	8	20.5%	39	100.0%
ALONG MAIN STREET WEST BETWEEN HWY. #8 & THE CITY LIMITS	17	43.6%	14	35.9%	8	20.5%	39	100.0%

B. Development In The Rural Area

TABLE E-5

RURAL SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT

AGREE	34	87.2%
DISAGREE	2	5.1%
NO RESPONSE	3	7.7%
TOTAL	39	100.0%

TABLE E-6

RESTRICTION OF LAND SEVERANCES IN PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREAS

AGREE	31	79.5%
DISAGREE	2	5.1%
NO RESPONSE	6	15.4%
TOTAL	39	100.0%

TABLE E-7

LESS RESTRICTION OF LAND SEVERANCES IN OTHER THAN
PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREAS

AGREE	22	56.4%
DISAGREE	9	23.1%
NO RESPONSE	8	20.5%
TOTAL	39	100.0%

C. Population

TABLE E-8

2001 HAMILTON POPULATION

LOW (355,000)	8	20.5%
MEDIUM (375,000 TO 385,000)	14	35.9%
HIGH (395,000)	14	35.9%
OTHER	3	7.7%
NO RESPONSE	0	0.0%
TOTAL	39	100.0%

D. Employment

TABLE E-9

2001 HAMILTON EMPLOYMENT

LOW	5	12.8%
MEDIUM	10	25.6%
HIGH	20	51.3%
OTHER	3	7.7%
NO RESPONSE	1	2.6%
TOTAL	39	100 0%

E. Industrial Development

TABLE E-10

LOCATION OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN HAMILTON

YES	34	87.2%
NO	4	10.2%
NO RESPONSE	1	2.6%
TOTAL	39	100.0%

F. Retail-Office Centres

TABLE E-11

DECENTRALIZATION OF RETAIL-OFFICE CENTRES

YES	24	61.5%
NO	14	35.9%
NO RESPONSE	1	2.6%
TOTAL	39	100.0%

G. Agriculture

TABLE E-12

ACCEPTABLE LOSS OF PRIME AGRICULTURAL LAND

YES (9,000 ACRES)	13	33.3%
NONE	0	0.0%
1,000 OR LESS	1	2.6%
UP TO 2,000	1	2.6%
UP TO 3,000	1	2.6%
UP TO 4,000	2	5.1%
UP TO 5,000	1	2.6%
UP TO 6,000	0	0.0%
UP TO 7,000	1	2.6%
UP TO 8,000	1	2.6%
AS LITTLE AS POSSIBLE	6	15.4%
UNSPECIFIED NO	9	23.0%
NO RESPONSE	3	7.7%
TOTAL	39	100.0%

H. The Fruit Belt

TABLE E-13

AMOUNT OF FRUITBELT TO BE PRESERVED

ALL	25	64.1%
MOST	13	33.3%
SOME	1	2.6%
NONE	0	0.0%
NO RESPONSE	0	0.0%
TOTAL	<u>39</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

I. Costs

TABLE E-14

WILLINGNESS TO SUPPORT MORE REGIONAL COSTS THAN
COSTS OF TRENT ALTERNATIVE (\$274 MILLION)

NO MORE	9	23.1%
5% MORE	9	23.1%
10% MORE	7	17.9%
15% MORE	3	7.7%
20% MORE	2	5.1%
OTHER	3	7.7%
NO RESPONSE	6	15.4%
TOTAL	<u>39</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

J. Airport

TABLE E-15

LOCATION OF EXPANDED AIRPORT

PRESENT SITE AT MOUNT HOPE	25	64.1%
ANOTHER SITE IN REGION	4	10.2%
SITE NEAR REGION	1	2.6%
OTHER	6	15.4%
NO RESPONSE	<u>3</u>	<u>7.7%</u>
TOTAL	39	100.0%

K. Landfill Sites

TABLE E-16

AGREEMENT WITH LOCATING LANDFILL SITE IN LOCAL MUNICIPALITY

YES	25	64.1%
NO	10	25.6%
NO RESPONSE	<u>4</u>	<u>10.3%</u>
TOTAL	39	100.0%

TABLE E-17

SERVICE AREA FOR LOCAL LANDFILL SITE

LOCAL MUNICIPALITY ONLY	12	30.8%
LOCAL MUNICIPALITY & PART OF THE REGION	10	25.6%
ENTIRE REGION	11	28.2%
OTHER	0	0.0%
NO RESPONSE	<u>6</u>	<u>15.4%</u>
TOTAL	39	100.0%

APPENDIX F - TABULAR RESULTS OF FLAMBOROUGH QUESTIONNAIRE

TABULAR RESULTS OF FLAMBOROUGH QUESTIONNAIRE

A. The Development Pattern

TABLE F-1

PROVISION OF HOUSING VARIETY IN EACH MUNICIPALITY

YES	125	71.8%
NO	38	21.9%
NO RESPONSE	<u>11</u>	<u>6.3%</u>
TOTAL	174	100.0%

TABLE F-2

TYPE OF HOUSING MIX FAVOURED FOR FLAMBOROUGH

ALL SINGLE FAMILY	38	21.9%
MOSTLY SINGLE FAMILY & SOME TOWNHOUSES	55	31.6%
MOSTLY SINGLE FAMILY, SOME TOWNHOUSES & SOME APARTMENTS	51	29.3%
AN EQUAL MIX OF SINGLE FAMILY, TOWNHOUSES & APARTMENTS	15	8.6%
OTHER	7	4.0%
NO RESPONSE	<u>8</u>	<u>4.6%</u>
TOTAL	174	100.0%

TABLE F-3

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PATTERN

TREND	11	6.3%
EASTERN	5	2.9%
C.O.L.U.C.	19	10.9%
SOUTH CENTRAL	20	11.5%
SOUTH DECENTRALIZED	12	6.9%
WESTERN	28	16.1%
CONGLOMERATE	34	19.5%
NONE	21	12.1%
OTHER	2	1.1%
NO RESPONSE	23	12.7%
TOTAL	174	100.0%

TABLE F-4

AGREEMENT WITH PROPOSED FLAMBOROUGH
LOCAL OFFICIAL PLAN

YES	78	44.8%
NO	61	35.1%
NO RESPONSE	35	20.1%
TOTAL	174	100.0%

TABLE F-5

PROVISION OF WATERDOWN AS A HERITAGE VILLAGE

YES	129	74.2%
NO	26	14.9%
NO RESPONSE	<u>19</u>	<u>10.9%</u>
TOTAL	174	100.0%

B. Development in the Rural Area

TABLE F-6

RURAL SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT

YES	128	73.6%
NO	36	20.7%
NO RESPONSE	<u>10</u>	<u>5.7%</u>
TOTAL	174	100.0%

TABLE F-7

RESTRICTION OF LAND SEVERANCES IN
PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREAS

FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES ONLY	37	21.3%
FOR FARM RETIREMENT & SONS & DAUGHTERS OF FARMERS	93	53.5%
OTHER	34	19.5%
NO RESPONSE	<u>10</u>	<u>5.7%</u>
TOTAL	174	100.0%

TABLE F-8

LESS RESTRICTION OF LAND SEVERANCES IN OTHER THAN
PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREAS

AGREE	138	79.3%
DISAGREE	23	13.2%
NO RESPONSE	<u>13</u>	<u>7.5%</u>
TOTAL	174	100.0%

C. Population

TABLE F-9

2001 FLAMBOROUGH POPULATION

LOW (26,100 TO 32,000)	75	43.1%
MEDIUM (45,000)	69	39.7%
HIGH (91,000)	23	13.2%
OTHER	4	2.3%
NO RESPONSE	<u>3</u>	<u>1.7%</u>
TOTAL	174	100.0%

D. Employment

TABLE F-10

2001 FLAMBOROUGH EMPLOYMENT

LOW	63	36.2%
MEDIUM	76	43.7%
HIGH	26	14.9%
OTHER	4	2.3%
NO RESPONSE	<u>5</u>	<u>2.9%</u>
TOTAL	174	100.0%

E. Industrial Development

-5-

TABLE F-11LOCATION OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN FLAMBOROUGH

YES	135	77.6%
NO	26	14.9%
NO RESPONSE	13	7.5%
TOTAL	174	100.0%

F. Retail-Office CentresTABLE F-12DECENTRALIZATION OF RETAIL-OFFICE CENTRES

YES	86	49.4%
NO	52	29.9%
NO RESPONSE	36	20.7%
TOTAL	174	100.0%

G. AgricultureTABLE F-13ACCEPTABLE LOSS OF PRIME AGRICULTURAL LAND

YES (9,000 ACRES)	91	52.3%
NONE	9	5.2%
1,000 OR LESS	3	1.7%
UP TO 2,000	1	.6%
UP TO 3,000	4	2.3%
UP TO 4,000	10	5.7%
UP TO 5,000	3	1.7%
UP TO 6,000	1	.6%
UP TO 7,000	0	0.0%
UP TO 8,000	0	0.0%
AS LITTLE AS POSSIBLE	6	3.4%
UNSPECIFIED NO	25	14.4%
NO RESPONSE	21	12.1%
TOTAL	174	100.0%

H. The Fruit Belt

TABLE F-14

AMOUNT OF FRUIT BELT TO BE PRESERVED

ALL	104	59.8%
MOST	44	25.3%
SOME	9	5.2%
NONE	3	1.7%
NO RESPONSE	14	8.0%
TOTAL	174	100.0%

I. Costs

TABLE F-15

WILLINGNESS TO SUPPORT MORE REGIONAL COSTS THAN
COSTS OF TREND ALTERNATIVE (\$274 MILLION)

NO MORE	51	29.3%
5% MORE	38	21.8%
10% MORE	28	16.1%
15% MORE	5	2.9%
20% MORE	9	5.2%
OTHER	8	4.6%
NO RESPONSE	35	20.1%
TOTAL	174	100.0%

J. Airport

TABLE F-16

LOCATION OF EXPANDED AIRPORT

PRESENT SITE AT MOUNT HOPE	133	76.4%
ANOTHER SITE IN REGION	7	4.0%
SITE NEAR REGION	3	1.7%
OTHER	10	5.8%
NO RESPONSE	<u>21</u>	<u>12.1%</u>
TOTAL	174	100.0%

K. Landfill Sites

TABLE F-17

AGREEMENT WITH LOCATING LANDFILL SITE IN LOCAL MUNICIPALITY

YES	87	50.0%
NO	49	28.2%
NO RESPONSE	<u>38</u>	<u>21.8%</u>
TOTAL	174	100.0%

TABLE F-18

SERVICE AREA FOR LOCAL LANDFILL SITE

LOCAL MUNICIPALITY ONLY	94	54.0%
LOCAL MUNICIPALITY & PART OF THE REGION	35	20.1%
ENTIRE REGION	8	4.6%
OTHER	4	2.3%
NO RESPONSE	<u>33</u>	<u>19.0%</u>
TOTAL	174	100.0%



THE HAMILTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

